arXiv:1605.01586v1 [math.LO] 5 May 2016

Categories with families, FOLDS and logic enriched type theory

Erik Palmgren
Department of Mathematics, Stockholm University

May 4, 2016

Abstract

Categories with families (cwfs) is an established semantical structure for dependent type theories, such as Martin-Löf type theory. Makkai's first-order logic with dependent sorts (FOLDS) is an example of a so-called logic enriched type theory. We introduce in this article a notion of *hyperdoctrine over a cwf*, and show how FOLDS and Aczel's and Belo's dependently typed (intuitionistic) first-order logic (DFOL) fit in this semantical framework. A soundness and completeness theorem is proved for such a logic. The semantics is functorial in the sense of Lawvere, and uses a dependent version of the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra for a DFOL theory. Agreement with standard first-order semantics is established. Some applications of DFOL to constructive mathematics and categorical foundations are given. A key feature is a *local propositions-as-types principle.*

AMS MSC 2010 classification: 03B15, 03F50, 03G30, 18C10, 68Q55

Keywords: Intuitionistic first-order logic, dependent types, categorical logic, models of type theory

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Preliminaries **4**

3 Dependently typed terms **5**
3.1 Presyntax 5
3.2 Basic dependent type systems 7
3.3 Structural theorems 13
3.4 Presuppositions 15
3.5 Variations 15

4 FOLDS vocabularies and signatures **17**

5 The category of contexts **20**
5.1 Categories with families 20
5.2 Structure of morphisms in cwfs 21
5.3 Pullbacks of canonical projections 23
5.4 Cwf morphisms 25
5.5 Free cwf on a signature 28
5.6 Grading the free cwf by proof height 33

6 Models for signatures and extension problems **34**
6.1 Models for type systems 34
6.2 Extension problem for signatures 39

7 Hyperdoctrines over CwFs **43**
7.1 Horn logic in any cwf 45
7.2 Interpretation into a category with families and type constructions . . 46

8 Dependently typed first-order logic **47**
8.1 Soundness and completeness 51
8.2 A variant with syntactic substitution 57

9 Some uses of dependently typed first-order logic **64**
9.1 Local propositions as types 65
9.2 Treatment of partial functions 65

10 Constructive elementary theory of the category of sets **66**

11 Equality on dependent types **68**

A Appendix: Proofs **72**

B Appendix: Type constructions on cwfs **88**

1 Introduction

Dependent families of sets often occur in mathematical notation, for instance as the fibers of a map $f : Y \to X$,

$$f^{-1}(x) \quad (x \in X)$$

$$\mathrm{inj}_x(u) \in Y \quad (x \in X, u \in f^{-1}(x))$$

or as the hom-sets of a category

$$\mathrm{Hom}(A, B) \quad (A, B \in \mathrm{Ob})$$

$$1_A \in \mathrm{Hom}(A, A) \quad (A \in \mathrm{Ob}).$$

Such expressions are however not directly supported in first-order logic. One may formulate them in a roundabout way using set-valued functions as in set theory, or

directly using dependent types (or sorts) as in Martin-Löf type theory. First-order logic with such dependent types, but avoiding complex type constructions, have been considered by Makkai (1995) and Aczel (2004). The dependently sorted system of first-order logic FOLDS was introduced and studied in a series of papers (Makkai 1995, 1998, 2013). The purpose of FOLDS is to provide a natural foundation for (higher) category theory that can also serve as a theory of abstract sets. Unlike set theory there is no global notion of equality in the system. When formalizing category theory in such systems one is thus not committed to introducing equality between objects, which makes it natural to define structures that are invariant under isomorphism. A system rather similar to FOLDS was introduced by Belo (2008) following an idea of Aczel (2004). It is based on the generalized algebraic theories of Cartmell 1986. In contrast to (Makkai 1995) it allows function symbols. The system may be regarded as a fairly natural extension of many sorted intuitionistic logic. Moreover an important property is that the system is straightforwardly interpretable in Martin-Löf type theory, and thus possible to use in connection with proof assistants such as Coq or Agda. This latter point is in line with the logic enriched type theories proposed by Maietti and Sambin (2005) and Gambino and Aczel (2006). In both those cases the underlying type theory has type constructors like Π and Σ and is thus more sophisticated.

A *category with families* (cwf) is a semantical structure for interpreting dependent type theories in categories using split fibrations (Dybjer 1996, Hofmann 1997, Jacobs 1999). This structure goes back to the contextual categories of Cartmell (1986). A purpose of the present paper is to show how Makkai's FOLDS and Aczel's and Belo's type systems gives rise to cwfs, and to establish some properties of these systems. We also introduce *hyperdoctrines over cwfs* as a general semantics of first-order logic with dependent sorts. A soundness and completeness theorem is proved for such a logic, DFOL. These hyperdoctrines over cwfs should also be a suitable semantic structure for Aczel–Gambino logic enriched type theories.

A complicating aspect of first-order dependent signatures is that the type and function symbol declarations may depend on each other. One cannot separate them as in standard many-sorted logic, and the use of Lawvere's functorial semantics becomes very natural in for this reason. Every dependent first-order type-and-function signature Σ generates a free cwf $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$. A *structure* $(\mathcal{C}, M)$ for the Σ-signature is defined as a cwf morphism $M : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. Such a morphism is uniquely determined by its values on the signature (Lemma 6.1). In Theorems 6.2 and 6.3 we show that such morphisms can be constructed incrementally by induction on the signature. Every first-order dependent theory T over a signature Σ with predicates Π generates a hyperdoctrine $\mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T}$ which is essentially a dependently typed Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra. A dependent first-order model of T consists of a Σ-structure $M : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and a hyperdoctrine $\mathcal{D}$ with an F-based hyperdoctrine morphism $G : \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$. Also these morphisms can be constructed incrementally by induction on the signature. This shows that this functorial notion of model extends the usual non-dependent version of model of first-order signature.

The paper is organized as follows. After preliminaries in Section 2, the type

system is set up in Section 3. FOLDS vocabularies are compared to the signatures of the present type systems in Section 4. Section 5 shows that the natural syntactic category of contexts coming from the type systems forms a cwf. The extension problem for signatures is considered in Section 6. Hyperdoctrines over cwfs are formulated in Section 7. A corresponding logic DFOL is studied in Section 8, and a completeness theorem (existence of universal model) and soundness theorem is proved. Sections 8 and 9 presents applications of DFOL: treatment of partial function, the local propositions-as-types property of DFOL, and a constructive version of Lawvere's theory ETCS. Section 10 deals briefly with possibility of treating the theory of setoids inside the theory.

Acknowledgements

This research was in part financially supported by the Swedish Research Council (VR). I am indebted to members of the Stockholm Logic Seminar for comments: Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine, Per Martin-Löf, and especially Håkon Robbestad Gylterud for discussions that lead to a better understanding of FOLDS signatures in terms of type theories.

2 Preliminaries

To treat the issue of fresh variables relative to a context of variable declarations we introduce the following notions. A set is *discrete* if for each pair of its elements x and y, $x = y$ or $\neg x = y$. Let V be an infinite discrete set. A *fresh variable provider (fvp) for* V is a pair of functions (φ, fr) which to each finite subset $X \subseteq V$, assigns an inhabited subset $\varphi(X) \subseteq V \setminus X$, and an element $\mathsf{fr}(X) \in \varphi(X)$. The first function provides the variables available after a context has used the variables X, the second function selects one of these variables. We call the tuple $V = (V, (\varphi, \mathsf{fr}))$ a *variable system.* A prime example of a fvp is defined by

$$\varphi_\infty(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = \{y \in V : \neg y = x_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, n\}, \tag{1}$$

and $\mathsf{fr}_\infty(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})$ selects some element in the set. Another example is when $V = \mathbb{N}_+$, $\mathsf{fr}_1(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = \max\{1, x_1 + 1, \ldots, x_n + 1\}$,

$$\varphi_1(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = \{\mathsf{fr}_1(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})\},$$

Here $\varphi_1(\emptyset) = \{1\}$. A variable system $(V, (\varphi, \mathsf{fr}))$ is said to have the *de Bruijn property* if $\varphi(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = \{\mathsf{fr}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})\}$. This will have the effect that the nth declared variable of any two contexts will be the same. The system is called *unrestricted* if φ satisfies (1). If $V = (V, (\varphi, \mathsf{fr}))$ is an arbitrary variable system, we write $V^{(1)}$ for $(V, (\varphi_{\mathsf{fr}}, \mathsf{fr}))$ where $\varphi_{\mathsf{fr}}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}) = \{\mathsf{fr}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\})\}$. This system has the de Bruijn property. We also write $V^{(\infty)}$ for $(V, (\varphi_\infty, \mathsf{fr}))$, and this is an unrestricted variable system.

We define untyped terms or pre-terms. Let $\mathrm{Ter}(M, V)$ denote the *pre-terms* that can be formed from variables V and function symbols from M. Syntactic equality of

terms is written $s \equiv t$. We assume that M is a discrete set and that V is a discrete set equipped with a fvp. We use standard notation for simultaneous substitution $s[t_1, \ldots, t_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and the set $\mathrm{V}(E)$ of variables in an expression E. We will use the following property as well.

Proposition 2.1 *For every $s \in \mathrm{Ter}(M, V)$, with $\mathrm{V}(s) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, if $t_1, \ldots, t_n$, $t'_1, \ldots, t'_n \in \mathrm{Ter}(M, V)$,*

$$s[t_1, \ldots, t_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] = s[t'_1, \ldots, t'_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \Longrightarrow t_1 = t'_1, \ldots, t_n = t'_n.$$

Proof. Induction on s. □

3 Dependently typed terms

The following type system is essentially that of Belo (2008) and is close that of Cartmell (1986) except that it does not use equality of types. A difference to (Belo 2008) is that we allow hidden arguments to function and type symbols, similarly to certain proof assistants (Coq and Agda), a device which can shorten expressions considerably. Our basic dependent type systems can code a limited form of Horn logic and equational logic, using the propositions-as-types principle.

Example 3.1 The following is a signature for a binary operation m with a congruence relation E

A type	$()$
$m(x, y) : A$	$(x, y : A)$
$E(x, y)$ type	$(x, y : A)$
$\rho(x) : E(x, x)$	$(x : A)$
$\sigma(p) : E(y, x)$	$(x, y : A, p : E(x, y))$
$\tau(p, q) : E(x, z)$	$(x, y, z : A, p : E(x, y), q : E(y, z))$
$\gamma(p, q) : E(m(x, y), m(u, v))$	$(x, y, u, v : A, p : E(x, u), q : E(y, v))$
$\alpha(x, y, z) : E(m(x, m(y, z)), m(m(x, y), z))$	$(x, y, z : A)$

Now we can, for example, add generators $a, b, c : A$ and a relation $ab = bc$ to specify a particular semigroup. This is done by introducing the axiom

$$\mathrm{ax}_1 : E(m(a, b), m(b, c))\ ()$$

3.1 Presyntax

Let V be a discrete set with a fvp (φ, fr). Let F and T be two discrete disjoint sets and let $M = F \cup T$. We call $\mathcal{S} = (V, (\varphi, \mathsf{fr}), F, T)$ a *symbol system*, where F is intended to be the set of function symbols and T to be the set of type symbols. For any syntactic expression E we denote by $\mathrm{V}(E)$ the set of variables in E.

A term $t \in \mathrm{Ter}(M, V)$ is called a *preelement* over $\mathcal{S}$ if it does not contain symbols from T; it is a *pretype* over $\mathcal{S}$ if it is of the form $S(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where all $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are prelements and $S \in T$.

A *precontext* over $\mathcal{S}$ is a sequence $\Gamma = \langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$, $n \geq 0$, where $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are pretypes over $\mathcal{S}$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are all in V with $x_k \in \varphi(\{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\})$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$, and $\mathrm{V}(A_k) \subseteq \{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Each $x_i : A_i$ is called a *variable declaration* and declares the variable x_i to be of type A_i. We define the set of variables of a precontext as $\mathrm{V}(\Gamma) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. The ordered sequence of variables of the precontext Γ is denoted

$$\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma) = x_1, \ldots, x_n \text{ or as } \breve{\Gamma} = x_1, \ldots, x_n.$$

The *length* $|\Gamma|$ of the context Γ is n. Below we will often use the following notation for substitution

$$E[a_1, \ldots, a_n/\Gamma] =_{\mathrm{def}} E[a_1, \ldots, a_n/\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)],$$

as well as $E[\bar{a}/\Gamma]$ where $\bar{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Define the following operations on contexts using the fvp. For a precontext Γ let

$$\mathrm{Fresh}(\Gamma) = \varphi(\mathrm{V}(\Gamma)) \qquad \mathrm{fresh}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{fr}(\mathrm{V}(\Gamma)).$$

The former is the set of variables that are fresh for Γ and the latter is a choice of one variable that is fresh for Γ. The set of *top-most variables* $\mathrm{TV}(\Gamma)$ of a precontext Γ is defined by induction on the length of Γ:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{TV}(\langle\rangle) &= \emptyset \\ \mathrm{TV}(\langle \Gamma, x : A \rangle) &= (\mathrm{TV}(\Gamma) \setminus \mathrm{V}(A)) \cup \{x\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus for example

$$\mathrm{TV}(\langle x : S, y : T(x), z : R(x, y), u : U(x) \rangle) = \{z, u\}.$$

The values of all other variables will be shown to be derivable from the top-most variables in a precise sense (Theorem 3.3). Precontexts (and contexts) $\langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$ will usually be written

$$x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$$

without brackets. We allow abbreviations when the same type occurs several times in juxtaposition, so that for instance

$$x : A, y, z : B, u : C, v, w : D$$

abbreviates

$$x : A, y : B, z : B, u : C, v : D, w : D.$$

A *type predeclaration* over $\mathcal{S}$ is a pair $(\Gamma, S, \bar{i})$ where Γ is a precontext over $\mathcal{S}$ and $S \in T$, and moreover $\bar{i} = i_1, \ldots, i_k$ is a strictly increasing sequence of indexes in $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that

$$\mathrm{TV}(\Gamma) \subseteq \{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\} \tag{2}$$

where $\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma) = x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Such $\bar{i}$ is called a *determining sequence*, and we let $\mathrm{DS}(\Gamma)$ denote the set of these. If $\Gamma = \langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$, we write $(\Gamma, S, i_1, \ldots i_k)$ as

$$S(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}) \text{ type} \qquad (\Gamma). \tag{3}$$

The constant *declared* is S. The relaxed condition (2) allows for hiding variables whose values are derivable. In case $\bar{i} = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we say that the declaration is on *standard form*. This is to say, all variables are used and come in the same order as in the context. A *function predeclaration* over $\mathcal{S}$ is a triple $(\Gamma, f, \bar{i}, U)$ where Γ is a precontext over $\mathcal{S}$ and $f \in F$ where U is a pretype over $\mathcal{S}$ with $\mathrm{V}(U) \subseteq \mathrm{V}(\Gamma)$, and $\bar{i} \in \mathrm{DS}(\Gamma)$. If $\Gamma = \langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$, we write $(\Gamma, f, i_1, \ldots, i_k, U)$ as

$$f(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}) : U \quad (\Gamma). \tag{4}$$

The constant *declared* is f. Again, in case $\bar{i} = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we say that the declaration is on *standard form*. For declarations on standard form we often omit the determining sequence $\bar{i}$. If D is any predeclaration, then we denote the constant declared by $\mathrm{decl}(D)$.

For instance, the predeclarations tuples for A, E and σ of Example 3.1 would read $(\langle\rangle, \varepsilon, A)$, $(\langle x : A, y : A \rangle, (1, 2), E)$ and $(\langle x : A, y : A, z : E(x, y) \rangle, (3), \sigma)$, respectively.

A (unordered) *presignature* over $\mathcal{S}$ is a set Σ of type predeclarations and function predeclarations satisfying the *consistency condition*: if $D_1, D_2 \in \Sigma$, $\mathrm{decl}(D_1) = \mathrm{decl}(D_2)$, then $D_1 = D_2$.

Below we shall use the following notation: for $\bar{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_n$ and $\bar{i} = i_1, \ldots, i_k$, with $1 \leq i_1, \ldots, i_k \leq n$, write

$$\bar{a}_{\bar{i}} = a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}.$$

A *judgement expression* is any of the following three expressions

Γ context

A type (Γ)

$a : A$ (Γ)

where Γ is a precontext, A is a pretype and, a is a prelement.

3.2 Basic dependent type systems

Let a symbol system $\mathcal{S} = ((V, (\varphi, \mathsf{fr})), F, T)$ be fixed. For any presignature Σ over this symbol system, let $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ be the smallest set of judgement expressions closed under following derivation rules (R1) – (R5) below.

$$\frac{}{\langle\rangle \text{ context}} \text{ (R1)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ context} \quad A \text{ type } (\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}} \text{ (R2)} \quad x \in \text{Fresh}(\Gamma)$$

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n)} \text{ (R3)}$$

To formulate the next two rules we introduce the notion of context map. Let Δ and $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ be two precontexts. We write

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma \tag{5}$$

for the conjunction of these $n + 2$ judgement expressions:

$$\begin{array}{l} \Delta \text{ context} \\ \Gamma \text{ context} \\ a_1 : A_1 \ (\Delta) \\ a_2 : A_2[a_1/x_1] \ (\Delta) \\ \quad \vdots \\ a_n : A_n[a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}] \ (\Delta) \end{array} \tag{6}$$

Note that (5) is to be thought of saying that $\bar{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is a context map or substitution from Δ into Γ. For $n = 0$, the conjunction is equivalent to the judgement Δ context. The sequence $\bar{a}$ can be inserted into correct function and type declarations according to the next rules.

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma}{S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) \text{ type } (\Delta)} \text{ (R4)} \qquad (\Gamma, S, \bar{i}) \text{ in } \Sigma$$

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma \quad U[\bar{a}/\Gamma] \text{ type } (\Delta)}{f(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) : U[\bar{a}/\Gamma] \ (\Delta)} \text{ (R5)} \qquad (\Gamma, f, \bar{i}, U) \text{ in } \Sigma$$

Note that rules R4 and R5 have $n + 2$ and $n + 3$ premisses, respectively.

Remark 3.2 Belo (2007) uses the notation $(\Gamma)\ A$ for our A type (Γ), and $(\Gamma)\ a : A$ for our $a : A\ (\Gamma)$.

Remark 3.3 Note that $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ depends only on V and the function φ of the variable system (not fr). A context

$$x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$$

is on *standard form* with respect to Σ, if $x_k = \mathsf{fr}(\{x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}\})$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$. An infinite sequence $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ of variables is *fresh* if

$$\sigma(n) \in \varphi(\{\sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n-1)\}),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The standard ordering of variables given by $v_n = \mathsf{fr}(\{v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}\})$ is an example of a fresh infinite sequence.

We define a context map which puts variables in the order of a fresh sequence σ. For a precontext Γ, let $\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma$ be given by the simultaneous recursive definition

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\langle\rangle) &= () \\ \sigma(\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle) &= (\sigma(\Gamma), \sigma(|\Gamma|)) \\ \langle\rangle^\sigma &= \langle\rangle \\ \langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle^\sigma &= \langle\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We show below in Lemma 5.3 that this is a context map whenever Γ is a context.

We introduce the following notation for later convenience: for $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ and $k \leq n$ write

$$\Gamma^k = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_k : A_k$$

and

$$\bar{a}^k = (a_1, \ldots, a_k).$$

Thus, for instance, the general term in (6) is

$$a_k : A_k[\bar{a}^{k-1}/\Gamma^{k-1}]\ (\Delta).$$

We define following (Belo 2007) a pre-signature Σ to be a *signature* if the following *correctness conditions* hold:

- If $(\Gamma, S, \bar{i}) \in \Sigma$, then ($\Gamma$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,
- If $(\Gamma, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$, then ($U$ type (Γ)) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

Returning briefly to Example 3.1 for illustration: to prove that the list of pre-declarations forms a correct signature we can build it up inductively. We note that $\Sigma_1 = \{(\langle\rangle, A, \varepsilon)\}$ is a signature since ($\langle\rangle$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\emptyset)$. Next to prove $\Sigma_2 = \Sigma_1 \cup \{(\langle x : A, y : A\rangle, E, (1, 2))\}$ is a signature, we need to show that ($\langle x : A, y : A\rangle$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_1)$. This is done by first deriving ($\langle x : A\rangle$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_1)$ with rule (R2). Then $(() : \langle x : A\rangle \longrightarrow \langle\rangle) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_1)$ is a context map, so (R4) may be applied to obtain (A type ($x : A$)) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_1)$. Thus by (R2), we get the desired ($\langle x : A, y : A\rangle$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_1)$. Derivations like these are much simplified by the weaking, strengthening and substitution theorems established in Section 3.3 below.

The *height of a derivation* is the height of a derivation tree, take the height of the derivation (R1) to be 0. If $\mathcal{U}$ is a judgement we write $\vdash_n \mathcal{U}$ for $\mathcal{U}$ is derivable with a derivation tree of height at most n. We will also be interested what the minimum number of applications of particular rule R. Write $\vdash_n^R \mathcal{U}$ for $\mathcal{U}$ is derivable with a derivation tree where at most n applications of rule R occur along any branch. For a signature Σ we denote by

$$\mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma) = \{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) : \ \vdash_n \mathcal{U}\}. \tag{7}$$

For the compound context map judgement, we write

$$\vdash_{m_1,m_2,m_3,\ldots,m_{n+2}} (a_1,\ldots,a_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$$

if the height of the $n+2$ derivation trees of the judgements in (6) are at most $m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots, m_{n+2}$, respectively.

The following are evident.

Lemma 3.4 *For pre-signatures $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma'$, $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$.* □

Lemma 3.5 *(i) The empty set is a signature.*

(ii) If Σ_i $(i \in I)$ is a family of signatures, then $\cup_{i\in I}\Sigma_i$ is a signature whenever it is satisfies the consistency condition.

□

We have moreover two possibilities to extend a signature.

Lemma 3.6 *Let Σ be a signature. Suppose that* (Γ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

(i) If $S \in T$ not declared in Σ and $\bar{i} \in \mathrm{DS}(\Gamma)$, then $\Sigma \cup \{(\Gamma, S, \bar{i})\}$ is a signature.

(ii) Suppose that (U type (Γ)) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. If $f \in F$ not declared in Σ and $\bar{i} \in \mathrm{DS}(\Gamma)$, then $\Sigma \cup \{(\Gamma, f, \bar{i}, U)\}$ is a signature.

□

A signature is called *inductive* if it is built from the empty signature using Lemma 3.6.

Remark 3.7 Ordinary many-sorted signatures are those where the contexts of type declarations are always empty, i.e. the types do not depend on other types.

Remark 3.8 If we restrict signatures to consist of only type declarations, we get a type system akin to that of FOLDS (Makkai 1995); see Section 4. It is an important class of signatures, which we call *FOLDS-like.*

Remark 3.9 The dependence between type declaration and function declarations may in general alternate in a signature. A rich class of declarations is obtained by declaring a single universal dependent type:

U type (),

$T(x)$ type $(x : U)$.

Further dependent types can then be simulated by declaring new terms in the "universe" U, for instance:

$a : U$ (),

$b(y) : U\ (y : T(a))$.

Now we can derive

$$T(b(y)) \text{ type } (y : T(a)),$$

which in effect works as a new dependent type: $B(y)$ type $(y : A)$.

Lemma 3.10 *Let Σ be a signature. Suppose that D is one of the declarations obtained in Lemma 3.6, and that it is on standard form. Then if $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma \cup \{D\})$, and $\mathcal{U}$ does not contain the symbol* $\mathrm{decl}(D)$*, then already $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.*

Proof. Induction on derivations. The only rule applications in a derivation where the symbol $\mathrm{decl}(D)$ can disappear from a judgement expression is R3 and R4. Now since the declarations are on standard form, nothing is lost going from $\bar{a}$ to $\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}$. Also by assumption (Γ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Thus $\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ does not contain $\mathrm{decl}(D)$, and is therefore in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ by inductive hypothesis. □

Proposition 3.1 *For signatures Σ on standard form, each judgement in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ has a unique derivation.*

Proof. If the signature is on standard form, then the whole sequence $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ can be read off from the conclusion of the rules (R4) and (R5). □

To obtain a decidability result for correctness of judgement expressions we require that a signature Σ can be *indexed* in the sense that there is a function

$$I : F \cup T \longrightarrow \Sigma \cup \{*\}$$

so that

$$D \in \Sigma \Longleftrightarrow (\exists s \in F \cup T) D = I(s),$$

and $\mathrm{decl}(I(s)) = s$ if $I(s) \neq *$.

Proposition 3.2 *Suppose that Σ is an indexed signature on standard form. Then there is an algorithm which decides whether a judgement expression belongs to $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.*

Proof. Proposition 3.1 indicates a deterministic procedure. By the indexing we can find whether a symbol has a declaration, and if so, what are its components. □

We believe that Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 are true for *any* indexed signatures, but shall not pursue this question here.

For arbitrary contexts Γ and Δ define $\Gamma \leq \Delta$ to hold if every variable declaration $x : A$ in Γ is also in Δ. Now the following is evident.

Lemma 3.11 *Consider derivations relative to a fixed signature. Suppose $\vdash_k \Gamma$ and $\vdash_d \Delta$ are contexts with $\Gamma \leq \Delta$. If $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$, then*

$$\vdash_{k,d,d+1,\ldots,d+1} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$$

is a context map.

Proof. For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have by (R3) and $\Gamma \leq \Delta$

$$\vdash_{d+1} x_i : A_i \ (\Delta).$$

Now since $A_i = A_i[x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}]$ we get

$$\vdash_{k,d,d+1,\ldots,d+1} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$$

as desired. □

We show that elements have unique types up to syntactic equality. Moreover it is shown that the positions indicated by the top-most variables determine the values of the other positions in context maps.

Theorem 3.3 *(Unique typing lemma) Consider derivations relative to a fixed signature. Let $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_n : B_n$ be a context.*

(a) If $a : A \ (\Delta)$ and $a : A' \ (\Delta)$, then $A \equiv A'$

(b) If $(a_1, \ldots, a_n), (b_1, \ldots, b_n) : \Gamma \to \Delta$ are contexts maps, with $a_i \equiv b_i$ for each $y_i \in \mathrm{TV}(\Delta)$, then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Remark 3.12 By this result the hidden arguments of a function or type declaration, as in (3) and (4), are unique if they exists. Indeed if

$$S(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \text{ type } (\Delta)$$

has been derived by R4 in two ways using substitutions $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ with $a_{i_j} = b_{i_j}$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$. Similarly suppose that

$$f(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \ (\Delta)$$

and

$$f(b_{i_1}, \ldots, b_{i_k}) : U[b_1, \ldots, b_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \ (\Delta)$$

had been derived using R5 and that $f(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) = f(b_{i_1}, \ldots, b_{i_k})$. Then again $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$. In either case, the remaining arguments can be obtained uniquely from $a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}$.

Remark 3.13 *Decision problems.* The following basic decision problems are of interest. Suppose Σ is an indexed signature and that $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

- (Correctness of types) For a pretype A, decide whether $(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.
- (Type checking) For a pretype A and a preelement a, decide whether

$$(a : A \ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \tag{8}$$

holds.

- (Type inference) For a preelement a, is there a pretype A such that (8) holds?
- (Type inhabitation) For a pretype A, is there a preelement a such that (8)?

The semigroup word problem can be encoded as a type inhabitation problem (cf. Example 3.1). Therefore the last problem cannot be expected to be decidable. We sketch the decision procedures for the remaining problems:

Correctness of types: The pretype A has the form $S(\bar{b})$ for some $\bar{b}$ and we must have some $(\Delta, \bar{i}, S) \in \Sigma$ with $|\bar{i}| = |\bar{b}|$, otherwise the type is not correct. Furthermore we must find $(\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ so that $\bar{a}_{\bar{i}} = \bar{b}$. We know ($\Gamma$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and (Δ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, so writing $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_m : B_m$ need to find $\bar{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_m$ with

$$\begin{array}{l} a_1 : B_1 \ (\Gamma) \\ a_2 : B_2[a_1/y_1] \ (\Gamma) \\ \quad \vdots \\ a_m : B_m[a_1, \ldots, a_{m-1}/y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1}] \ (\Gamma) \end{array} \tag{9}$$

The sequence $\bar{i}$ contains the positions of the topmost variables in Δ, and in particular m, so a_m is determined. By induction, we can then find the type a_m say C such that $a_m : C \ (\Gamma)$. Suppose that $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ is the increasing sequence $k \geq 0$ such that $y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_k}$ are exactly the variables that occur in B_m. Thus we must have for some $a_{j_1}, \ldots, a_{j_k}$ that

$$C = B_m[a_{j_1}, \ldots, a_{j_k}/y_{j_1}, \ldots, y_{j_k}].$$

If $k = 0$, and $m > 0$, $m - 1$ must be in $\bar{i}$ and we can continue the procedure with a_{m-1}. If $k > 0$, then $a_{j_1}, \ldots, a_{j_k}$ have been determined, and the procedure continues with these. This is repeated until all of $\bar{a}$ has been determined.

Type inference: Let a be given. If a is a variable, then the type of a is A only if $a : A$ occurs in Γ. Suppose that $a = f(\bar{b})$. The we must have some $(\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$ such that $|\bar{i}| = |\bar{b}|$ otherwise a cannot be typed. As in the correctness of types problem above we check if there is $(\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ so that $\bar{b} = \bar{a}_{\bar{i}}$. Then type of a must be $U[\bar{a}/\Delta]$.

Type checking: Let a and A be given. We check using type inference whether a has some type B, and then check if $A = B$.

3.3 Structural theorems

The following structural results about the type system are rather standard and occur in one form or another in (Cartmell 1978) and (Belo 2008). We postpone the detailed proofs for most of them to the Appendix.

We establish a standard substitution lemma as well some structural rules (weakening, strengthening and interchange) for the type system.

Theorem 3.4 *(Substitution lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ. Suppose that $\vdash_{\bar{m}} \bar{s} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$.*

(a) If $\vdash_k B$ type (Γ), then $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{m})} B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ type (Θ).

(b) If $\vdash_k b : B\ (\Gamma)$*, then* $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{m})} b[\bar{s}/\Gamma] : B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]\ (\Theta)$*.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Theorem 3.5 *(Weakening lemma) Consider derivations in* $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ *for a fixed signature* Σ *with unrestricted variable system. Suppose that* $\vdash B$ type (Γ)*. Let* y *be a variable not in* $\mathrm{V}(\Gamma, \Theta)$*.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma, \Theta$ context*, then* $\vdash \Gamma, y : B, \Theta$ context

(b) If $\vdash A$ type (Γ, Θ)*, then* $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$

(c) If $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Assuming that signatures are on standard form we can reverse this process:

Theorem 3.6 *(Strengthening lemma) Consider derivations in* $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ *for a fixed signature* Σ *with unrestricted variable system. Let* y *be a variable not in* $\mathrm{V}(\Theta, A, a)$*.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma, y : B, \Theta$ context*, then* $\vdash \Gamma, \Theta$ context*.*

(b) If $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash A$ type (Γ, Θ)*.*

(c) If $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, \Theta)$*.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

For standard form signatures, variable declarations may be interchanged provided they satisfy a simple syntactic condition.

Theorem 3.7 *(Interchange lemma) Consider derivations in* $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ *for a fixed signature* Σ *with unrestricted variable system. Suppose that* $x \notin \mathrm{V}(C)$*.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma, x; B, y : C, \Theta$ context*, then* $\vdash \Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta$ context*.*

(b) If $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta)$*.*

(c) If $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash a : A\ (\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta)$*.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

3.4 Presuppositions

Two of the judgement forms have *presuppositions.* Define for judgement expressions:

- A type (Γ) presupposes that Γ context,
- $a : A$ (Γ) presupposes that A type (Γ), and Γ context.

Theorem 3.8 *Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ.*

(a) If $\vdash_k A$ type (Γ), then $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context.

(b) If $\vdash_k \Gamma, x : A$ context, then $\vdash_{k-1} A$ type (Γ).

(c) If $\vdash_k \Gamma, x : A$ context, then $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context.

(d) If $\vdash_k x : A$ (Γ) and x is a variable, then $\vdash_{k-2} A$ type (Γ).

(e) If $\vdash_k f(\bar{b}) : A$ (Γ), then $\vdash_{k-1} A$ type (Γ).

(f) If $\vdash_k a : A$ (Γ), then $\vdash_{k-1} A$ type (Γ).

Proof. Cases (a) – (c) and (e) are immediate as the presuppositions are found in the premisses of the last applied rule.

Case (d): only rule (R3) can achieve $\vdash_k x : A$ (Γ), so $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context. Using (a) and (b) at least once we get $\vdash_{k-2} A$ type (Γ).

Case (f): follows from (d) and (e). □

3.5 Variations

In the type system of (Belo 2008) the (R5) rule is instead

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma}{f(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) : U[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\ (\Delta)}\ (\text{R5}^*) \qquad (\Gamma, f, \bar{i}, U) \text{ in } \Sigma$$

(However, that system use only declarations on standard form.) Define $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$ just as $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ but using the (R5*) rule instead of (R5). We have evidently $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$, since (R5*) has fewer premisses than (R5). Towards proving the reverse inclusion we have the following results.

Lemma 3.14 *(Substitution lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ. Suppose that $\vdash_{\bar{m}} \bar{s} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$.*

(a) If $\vdash_k B$ type (Γ), then $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{m})} B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ type (Θ).

(b) If $\vdash_k b : B$ (Γ), then $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{m})} b[\bar{s}/\Gamma] : B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ (Θ).

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.4. □

Lemma 3.15 *(Substitution lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ. Let R be an application of rule R5* with respect to a fixed function constant. Suppose that $\vdash^R_{\bar{m}} \bar{s} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$.*

(a) If $\vdash^R_k B$ type (Γ), then $\vdash^R_{k+\max(\bar{m})} B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ type (Θ).

(b) If $\vdash^R_k b : B$ (Γ), then $\vdash^R_{k+\max(\bar{m})} b[\bar{s}/\Gamma] : B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ (Θ).

Proof. As above, but we get an overestimation of the height. □

Lemma 3.16 *Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ.*

(a) If $\vdash_k A$ type (Γ), then $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context.

(b) If $\vdash_k \Gamma, x : A$ context, then $\vdash_{k-1} A$ type (Γ).

(c) If $\vdash_k \Gamma, x : A$ context, then $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context.

(d) If $\vdash_k x : A$ (Γ) and x is a variable, then $\vdash_{k-2} A$ type (Γ).

(e) If $\vdash_k f(\bar{b}) : A$ (Γ), then

$$\vdash_{u+k-1} A \text{ type } (\Gamma)$$

where $A = U[\bar{a}/\Delta]$, $(\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$ and $\vdash_u U$ type (Δ), $\vdash_{k-1} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ and $\bar{b} = \bar{a}_{\bar{i}}$.

(f) Suppose Σ is finite. Then there is $u \geq 0$, such that if $\vdash_k a : A$ (Γ), then

$$\vdash_{k+u} A \text{ type } (\Gamma).$$

Proof. Cases (a) – (c) are immediate as the presuppositions are found in the premisses of the last applied rule.

Case (d): only rule (R3) can achieve $\vdash_k x : A$ (Γ), so $\vdash_{k-1} \Gamma$ context. Using (a) and (b) at least once we get $\vdash_{k-2} A$ type (Γ).

Case (e): Note that $\vdash_k f(\bar{b}) : A$ (Γ) can only be derived by an application of (R5*). Thus there are $\vdash_{\bar{\ell}} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ and $(\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$ with $A = U[\bar{a}/\Delta]$. By the correctness requirement on signatures

$$\vdash_u U \text{ type } (\Delta)$$

for some u. By the Substitution Lemma we get

$$\vdash_{u+\max(\bar{\ell})} U[\bar{a}/\Delta] \text{ type } (\Gamma).$$

Noting that $\max(\bar{\ell}) \leq k - 1$ finishes the proof.

Case (f): this follows from (e) by taking the maximum of the us appearing for function declarations in Σ. □

Introduce the following notation $\Sigma \vdash \mathcal{U}$ for $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and $\Sigma \vdash^* \mathcal{U}$ for $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$.

Lemma 3.17 *Suppose that Σ is a signature such that $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Assume that $D = (\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U)$ is a predeclaration, where f is not declared in Σ, and where $(U \text{ type } (\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. Then for $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{D\}$*

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma') = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma').$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Lemma 3.18 *Suppose that Σ is a signature such that $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Assume that $D = (\Delta, \bar{i}, S)$ is a predeclaration, where S is not declared in Σ, and where $(\Delta \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. Then for $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{D\}$*

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma') = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma').$$

Proof. See Appendix A. □

As a consequence of these lemmas we have:

Theorem 3.9 *If Σ is a finite, inductive signature, then $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$.*

4 FOLDS vocabularies and signatures

A finite FOLDS *vocabulary* (or *dependent sorts vocabulary,* DSV) (Makkai 1995) is given by a finite, skeletal category K, which is one-way (has no non-trivial endomorphisms).

Example 4.1 The category with three objects

$$T \underset{t}{\overset{s}{\rightrightarrows}} A \underset{c}{\overset{d}{\rightrightarrows}} O$$

and the six non-identity arrows s, t, d, c, $ds = dt$ and $cs = ct$, is a FOLDS vocabulary K_2. It is suitable for describing a 2-category.

We show how to translate any FOLDS vocabulary K to a FOLDS-like signature. First define a binary relation $\leq$ on the objects by

$$A \leq B \Longleftrightarrow_{\text{def}} \text{there is a morphism from } B \text{ to } A.$$

By the properties of K this is a well-founded partial order. Let $\leq^*$ be some linear order that extends $\leq$. Note that $A \leq^* B$ implies that there can be no non-identity morphism $A \longrightarrow B$. (Otherwise, we have $A = B$ and a nontrivial endomorphism on A). Construct for every object A a non-repeating enumeration

$$x_1^A, \ldots, x_{n(A)}^A$$

of all the non-identity morphisms in K with domain A, which is such that

$$\text{cod}(x_i^A) \leq^* \text{cod}(x_j^A) \text{ whenever } i < j.$$

We now define a signature where the objects of K become the type symbols and where the morphisms of K serve as variables in the declarations. For this purpose we assume that $K \subseteq V$ for some infinite discrete set V with fop $(\varphi_\infty, \mathsf{fr}_\infty)$.

If $\bar{u} = u_1, \ldots, u_n$ is a sequence of elements in K and $v \in K$, with $\mathrm{dom}(u_i) = \mathrm{cod}(v)$, for all i, we write $\bar{u}^v$ for

$$u_1 v, \ldots, u_n v.$$

For each object A of K we define a type pre-declaration (on standard form)

$$\mathcal{D}_A =_{\mathrm{def}} (\Gamma_A, A)$$

by induction on $\leq$. Let

$$\Gamma_A = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \tag{10}$$

where $x_i = x_i^A$, and

$$A_i = C_i(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_i})^{x_i})$$

with $C_i = \mathrm{cod}(x_i)$ and $n = n(A)$.

If

$$B_1 <^* B_2 <^* \cdots <^* B_N$$

are all the objects of K, then the pre-signature corresponding to the vocabulary K is

$$\Sigma_K = \{\mathcal{D}_{B_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_{B_N}\}.$$

Returning to Example 4.1 above, we start by choosing order and enumerations

- $O <^* A <^* T$
- $x_1^T, x_2^T, x_3^T, x_4^T = ds, cs, s, t$
- $x_1^A, x_2^A = c, d$
- $n(O) = 0$.

We get the following contexts:

- $\Gamma_O = \langle\rangle$
- $\Gamma_A = \langle c : O, d : O\rangle = \langle x_1 : O, x_2 : O\rangle$
-

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_T &= \langle ds : O, cs : O, s : A(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_A)^s), t : A(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_A)^t)\rangle \\
&= \langle ds : O, cs : O, s : A(cs, ds), t : A(ct, dt)\rangle \\
&= \langle ds : O, cs : O, s : A(cs, ds), t : A(cs, ds)\rangle \\
&= \langle x_1 : O, x_2 : O, x_3 : A(x_2, x_1), x_4 : A(x_2, x_1)\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

The resulting signature is

$$\Sigma_{K_2} = \{(\Gamma_O, O), (\Gamma_A, A), (\Gamma_T, T)\}.$$

Note that with an alternate choice of the enumerations the order of the arguments can be different.

It can be proved that Σ_K is a signature for an arbitrary K:

Theorem 4.1 *For any FOLDS vocabulary K, the pre-signature Σ_K is a signature.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

FOLDS vocabularies give a canonical way of maximally hiding variables for the corresponding signature. A morphism f of a FOLDS vocabulary K is called *reducible* there are two non-identity arrows g and h in K such that $f = gh$.

Proposition 4.2 *For a FOLDS vocabulary K, and each object A of K, the top variables* $\mathrm{TV}(\Gamma_A)$ *are exactly the non-reducible arrows in K with domain A.*

Proof. With reference to the context (10), note that x_i is not a top variable if, and only if ,x_i occurs in some A_j with $j > i$. If x_i occurs in A_j, $j > i$, then x_i is reducible. Conversely, if x_i is reducible, then $x_i = ux_j$, for some x_j and some non-identity u. Now $\mathrm{cod}(x_j) = C_j$, so u is variable in Γ_{C_j} by construction. Thus ux_j occurs in $(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_j}))^{x_j}$, and indeed x_i occurs in A_j. Now since $x_i = ux_j$ we must have $j \neq i$, and $j < i$ would imply $\mathrm{cod}(x_j) \leq^* \mathrm{cod}(x_i)$, saying that there can be no non-identity map from $\mathrm{cod}(x_j)$ to $\mathrm{cod}(x_i)$, which however u is an example of. Hence $j > i$. □

Consider the other direction, from signatures to vocabularies. Suppose a FOLDS-like inductive signature $\Sigma = \{\mathcal{D}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_N\}$ on standard form is given. Thus one can write

$$\mathcal{D}_i = (\Gamma_i, S_i),$$

$n(i) = \mathrm{length}(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_i))$, and without any loss of generality one can assume that variables are chosen as follows

$$\Gamma_i = x^i_1 : A^i_1, \ldots, x^i_{n(i)} : A^i_{n(i)},$$

and so that $x^i_j = x^{i'}_{j'}$ implies $i = i'$ and $j = j'$, and moreover that for $j = 1, \ldots, n(i)$,

$$A^i_j = S_{f(i,j)}(x^i_{g(i,j,1)}, \ldots, x^i_{g(i,j,n(f(i,j)))}).$$

Here $\mathrm{dom}(f) = \{(i,j) : i = 1, \ldots, N, j = 1, \ldots, n(i)\}$. By the inductiveness of the signature we can assume that $1 \leq f(i,j) < i$, so that $S_{f(i,j)}$ has been declared before S_i. We also have that $1 \leq g(i,j,k) < i$.

Define a finite category K_Σ as follows. Its objects are $\{S_1, \ldots, S_N\}$, the type symbols declared in the signature. Define first a directed acyclic graph with multiple edges. Its vertices are the objects above. For every $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n(i)$

we declare x^i_j to be an arc from S_i to $S_{f(i,j)}$. Now generate the free category on this graph. A typical path starting at S_i looks like this

$$x^{f(\cdots f(f(f(i,j_1),j_2),j_3),\ldots,j_{n-1})}_{j_n} \cdots x^{f(f(i,j_1),j_2)}_{j_3} x^{f(i,j_1)}_{j_2} x^i_{j_1}$$

The following relations then generate the equivalence relation on paths

$$x^{f(i,j)}_k x^i_j = x^i_{g(i,j,k)} \qquad (1 \leq j \leq n(i), 1 \leq k \leq n(f(i,j))).$$

This defines the category K_Σ. It is skeletal and contains no nontrivial endomorphisms since the free category has these properties.

We summarize this as a

Theorem 4.3 *For any finite inductive FOLDS-like signature Σ, the category K_Σ is a FOLDS vocabulary.* □

5 The category of contexts

5.1 Categories with families

Categories with families (Dybjer 1996) is one of several equivalent ways of defining categorical semantics for dependent type theories (Hofmann 1997). We recall:

Definition 5.1 A *category with families (cwf)* consists of the following data

(a) A category $\mathcal{C}$ with a terminal object $\top$. This is thought of as the category of contexts and substitutions. For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ denote by ϵ_Γ the unique morphism $\Gamma \longrightarrow \top$.

(b) For each object Γ of $\mathcal{C}$, a class $\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and for each morphism $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$, a class function $\mathrm{Ty}(f) : \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ty}(\Delta)$, for which use the notation $A\{f\}$ for $\mathrm{Ty}(f)(A)$, to suggest that it is the result of performing the substitution f in the type A. These functions should satisfy, for all $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, and $g : \Theta \longrightarrow \Delta$, $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$:

(i) $A\{1_\Gamma\} = A$,

(ii) $A\{f \circ g\} = A\{f\}\{g\}$.

(Thus Ty may be regarded as a functor $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Class}$.)

(c) For each $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, an object $\Gamma.A$ in $\mathcal{C}$ and a morphism $\mathrm{p}(A) = \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(A) : \Gamma.A \longrightarrow \Gamma$. This tells that each context can be extended by a type in the context, and that there is a projection from the extended context to the original one.

(d) For each $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, there is a class $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$ — thought of as the terms of type A. It should be such that for $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ there is a class function $\mathrm{Tm}(f) : \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A) \to \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, A\{f\})$, where we write $a\{f\}$ for $\mathrm{Tm}(f)(a)$. It should satisfy the following

(i) $a\{1_\Gamma\} = a$ for $a \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$ $(= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A\{1_\Gamma\}))$.

(ii) $a\{f \circ g\} = a\{f\}\{g\}$ for $a \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$
(Note: $\mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A\{f \circ g\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A\{f\}\{g\})$.)

(e) For each $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Delta)$ there is an element $\mathrm{v}_A \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta.A, A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$.

(f) For any morphism $f : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ and $a \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A\{f\})$, there is

$$\langle f, a\rangle_A : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta.A.$$

This construction should satisfy

(i) $\mathrm{p}(A) \circ \langle f, a\rangle_A = f$,

(ii) $\mathrm{v}_A\{\langle f, a\rangle_A\} = a$,
(Note: $\mathrm{v}_A\{\langle f, a\rangle_A\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}\{\langle f, a\rangle_A\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A\{f\}))$

(iii) $\langle \mathrm{p}(A) \circ h, \mathrm{v}_A\{h\}\rangle_A = h$ for any $h : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta.A$.

(iv) for any $g : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$,

$$\langle f, a\rangle_A \circ g = \langle f \circ g, a\{g\}\rangle_A \tag{11}$$

(Remark: $a\{g\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A\{f\}\{g\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A\{f \circ g\})$.) $\square$

A cwf $\mathcal{C}$ is *separated* if for any $\Gamma, \Delta \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Delta)$,

$$\Gamma.A = \Delta.B \Longrightarrow \Gamma = \Delta \text{ and } A = B.$$

A cwf $\mathcal{C}$ is *contextual* for every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a unique sequence $A_1 \in \mathrm{Ty}(\top)$, $A_2 \in \mathrm{Ty}(\top.A_1)$,..., $A_n \in \mathrm{Ty}(\top.A_1.\ldots.A_{n-1})$, $n \geq 0$ such that

$$\Gamma = \top.A_1.\ldots.A_n. \tag{12}$$

5.2 Structure of morphisms in cwfs

Let $\Theta \in \mathcal{C}$. There is a unique morphism $\varepsilon_\Theta : \Theta \longrightarrow \top$. For $a_1 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_1\{\varepsilon_\Theta\})$, we have

$$\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1} : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.$$

For $a_2 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_2\{\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1}\})$, we get

$$\langle\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1}, a_2\rangle_{A_2} : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.A_2.$$

For $a_3 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_3\{\langle\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1}, a_2\rangle_{A_2}\})$, we get

$$\langle\langle\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1}, a_2\rangle_{A_2} a_3\rangle_{A_3} : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.A_2.A_3$$

We introduce the notation

$$[a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta; A_1, \ldots, A_n} = \langle \cdots \langle\langle \varepsilon_\Theta, a_1\rangle_{A_1}, a_2\rangle_{A_2}, \ldots, a_n\rangle_{A_n},$$

which satisfies the recursive equations

$$[]_\Theta = \varepsilon_\Theta, \tag{13}$$

$$[a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_{n+1}} = \langle [a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}, a_{n+1}\rangle_{A_{n+1}}. \tag{14}$$

Dropping subscripts and curly braces in applications of substitution we can write

$$B[a_1, \ldots, a_n] = B\{[a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}\}$$

and

$$b[a_1, \ldots, a_n] = b\{[a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}\}.$$

The above is then more succinctly rendered as: For $a_1 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_1[])$,

$$[a_1] : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.$$

For $a_2 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_2[a_1])$, we get

$$[a_1, a_2] : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.A_2.$$

For $a_3 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_3[a_1, a_2])$, we get

$$[a_1, a_2, a_3] : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.A_2.A_3$$

and in general for $a_k \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_k[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{k-1}])$,

$$[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_k] : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.A_2.\ldots.A_k. \tag{15}$$

For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Theta$ we get by repeated uses of (11)

$$[a_1, \ldots, a_n] \circ f = [a_1\{f\}, \ldots, a_n\{f\}].$$

If $f = [b_1, \ldots, b_m]$, we obtain

$$[a_1, \ldots, a_n] \circ [b_1, \ldots, b_m] = [a_1[b_1, \ldots, b_m], \ldots, a_n[b_1, \ldots, b_m]]. \tag{16}$$

For contexts on the form (12) we introduce the notation

$$\mathrm{p}^{(0)}_\Gamma = \mathrm{id}_\Gamma$$

$$\mathrm{p}^{(k+1)}_{\Gamma.A} = \mathrm{p}^{(k)}_\Gamma \circ \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(A).$$

Then

$$\mathrm{p}^{(i)}_{\top.A_1.\ldots.A_n} : \top.A_1.\ldots.A_n \longrightarrow \top.A_1.\ldots.A_{n-i}$$

and

$$\mathrm{p}^{(i)}_{\top.A_1.\ldots.A_n} = \mathrm{p}(A_{n-i+1}) \cdots \mathrm{p}(A_n).$$

For an arbitrary $f : \Theta \longrightarrow \top.A_1.\ldots.A_n$ we can then write using (f.3)

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \langle \mathrm{p}(A_n) \circ f, \mathrm{v}_{A_n}\{f\}\rangle \\ &= \langle\langle \mathrm{p}(A_{n-1})\mathrm{p}(A_n)f, \mathrm{v}_{A_{n-1}}\{\mathrm{p}(A_n)f\}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{A_n}\{f\}\rangle \\ &= \langle\langle\langle \mathrm{p}(A_{n-2})\mathrm{p}(A_{n-1})\mathrm{p}(A_n)f, \mathrm{v}_{A_{n-2}}\{\mathrm{p}(A_{n-1})\mathrm{p}(A_n)f\}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{A_{n-1}}\{\mathrm{p}(A_n)f\}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{A_n}\{f\}\rangle \\ &\vdots \\ &= [\mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}f\}, \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-2)}f\}, \ldots, \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(1)}f\}, \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(0)}f\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing the special notation

$$f_{(i)} = \mathrm{v}_{A_i}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-i)}f\},$$

we have

$$f = [f_{(1)}, \ldots, f_{(n)}].$$

The identity $\mathrm{id}_\Gamma = \mathrm{id}$ can be regarded as a generic element of $\Gamma = \top.A_1.\ldots.A_n$. If introduce suggestively the ith variable as

$$\mathsf{x}_i =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{id}_{(i)} = \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-i)}\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\top.A_1.\ldots.A_n, A_i\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-i+1)}\}) \tag{17}$$

we get

$$\mathrm{id} = [\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_n].$$

Note that

$$\mathsf{x}_i\{f\} = f_{(i)}.$$

Moreover

$$\mathrm{p}^{(i)}_\Gamma = [\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_{n-i}].$$

With the notation

$$\mathrm{v}_i = \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(i-1)}\}$$

we get de Bruijn indices, and

$$\mathrm{v}_i = \mathsf{x}_{n-i+1},$$

so

$$\mathrm{id} = [\mathrm{v}_n, \ldots, \mathrm{v}_1]$$

and

$$\mathrm{p}^{(i)}_\Gamma = [\mathrm{v}_n, \ldots, \mathrm{v}_{i+1}].$$

5.3 Pullbacks of canonical projections

Pullbacks along canonical projections are particularly well behaved in cwfs, and occur in substitutive properties of quantifiers. We define the following. For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ and $S \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ a morphism $\mathrm{q}(f, S) : \Delta.S\{f\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.S$ set

$$\mathrm{q}(f, S) =_{\mathrm{def}} \langle f \circ \mathrm{p}_\Delta(S\{f\}), \mathsf{v}_{S\{f\}}\rangle_{\mathrm{S}}.$$

We use the suggestive notation

$$f.S =_{\text{def}} \mathrm{q}(f, S).$$

As is shown in (Hofmann 1997) one obtains a pullback square which behaves functorially in f:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta.S\{f\} & \xrightarrow{f.S} & \Gamma.S \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}_\Delta(S\{f\})}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(S)} \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow[f]{} & \Gamma \end{array} \tag{18}$$

These functoriality properties are

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 1_\Gamma.S & = & 1_{\Gamma.S} \\ (f \circ g).S & = & (f.S) \circ (g.S\{f\}). \end{array}$$

By the definition of q it follows that

$$\mathrm{v}_S\{f.S\} = \mathrm{v}_{S\{f\}}. \tag{19}$$

Further we have the equation

$$f.S \circ \langle g, N\rangle = \langle f \circ g, N\rangle. \tag{20}$$

By composing pullback squares we have the following pullback for repeated extensions of contexts.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta.S_1\{f\}.S_2\{f.S_1\}.\ldots.S_n\{f.S_1.\ldots.S_{n-1}\} & \xrightarrow{f.S_1.\ldots.S_n} & \Gamma.S_1.\ldots.S_n \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}^{(n)}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}^{(n)}} \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow[f]{} & \Gamma \end{array} \tag{21}$$

We denote a repeated extension $\Gamma.S_1.\ldots.S_n$ by $\Gamma.\Sigma$ where $\Sigma = S_1.\ldots.S_n$. Note that Σ is in general not a context by itself. Introduce the notation

$$\Sigma\{f\} = S_1\{f\}.S_2\{f.S_1\}.\ldots.S_n\{f.S_1.\ldots.S_{n-1}\}.$$

We also write for iterated projections

$$\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\Sigma) = \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(S_1)\mathrm{p}_{\Gamma.S_1}(S_2)\cdots\mathrm{p}_{\Gamma.S_1.\ldots.S_{n-1}}(S_n).$$

Note that for $n = 1$ this the usual projection, and for $n = 0$ it is the identity. Then (21) may be written

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta.\Sigma\{f\} & \xrightarrow{f.\Sigma} & \Gamma.\Sigma \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}_\Delta(\Sigma\{f\})}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\Sigma)} \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow[f]{} & \Gamma \end{array} \tag{22}$$

The functoriality properties also extend to this notation

- $1_\Gamma.\Sigma = 1_{\Gamma.\Sigma}$
- $(f \circ g).\Sigma = (f.\Sigma) \circ (g.\Sigma\{f\})$.

Moreover introducing the notation

$$\mathrm{v}_{A.\Sigma} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{v}_A\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma)\}$$

we have

$$\mathrm{v}_{A.\Sigma} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta.A.\Sigma, A\{\mathrm{p}(A.\Sigma)\}).$$

5.4 Cwf morphisms

Dybjer (1996) defines the notion of morphism between cwfs. Explained in terms of the definition above, it is as follows.

Definition 5.2 A *cwf morphism* from a cwf $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Ty}, \mathrm{Tm})$ to another cwf $\mathcal{C}' = (\mathcal{C}', \mathrm{Ty}', \mathrm{Tm}')$ is a triple (F, σ, θ) consisting of a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}'$ such that

$$F(\top_{\mathcal{C}}) = \top_{\mathcal{C}'} \tag{23}$$

and a family of functions $\sigma_\Gamma : \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma) \to \mathrm{Ty}'(F(\Gamma))$ satisfying the naturality condition for $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, and $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_\Gamma} & \mathrm{Ty}'(F(\Gamma)) \\ {\scriptstyle _\{f\}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle _\{F(f)\}} \\ \mathrm{Ty}(\Delta) & \xrightarrow[\sigma_\Delta]{} & \mathrm{Ty}'(F(\Delta)). \end{array} \tag{24}$$

commutes (that is $\sigma : \mathrm{Ty} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ty}' \circ F$ is a natural transformation) and such that

$$F(\Gamma.A) = F(\Gamma).\sigma_\Gamma(A)$$

and

$$F(\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(A)) = \mathrm{p}_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)) \tag{25}$$

and as third component a family of functions

$$\theta_{\Gamma,A} : \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A) \to \mathrm{Tm}'(F(\Gamma), \sigma_\Gamma(A))$$

such that for $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A) & \xrightarrow{\theta_{\Gamma,A}} & \mathrm{Tm}'(F(\Gamma), \sigma_\Gamma(A)) \\ {\scriptstyle _\{f\}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle _\{F(f)\}} \\ \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, A\{f\}) & \xrightarrow[\theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}]{} & \mathrm{Tm}'(F(\Delta), \sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})). \end{array} \tag{26}$$

It is required that for $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$,

$$\theta_{\Gamma.A, A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}}(\mathrm{v}_A) = \mathrm{v}_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \tag{27}$$

(the left hand side is in

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{Tm}'(F\Gamma.FA, \sigma_{\Gamma.A}(A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})) & = & \mathrm{Tm}'(F\Gamma.FA, \sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(\mathrm{p}(A))\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}'(F\Gamma.FA, \sigma_\Gamma(A)\{\mathrm{p}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))\}) \end{array}$$

so the right hand side has correct type) and moreover it is required that for $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ and $a \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, A\{f\})$,

$$F(\langle f, a\rangle_A) = \langle F(f), \theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a)\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)}. \tag{28}$$

(Here the left hand side is in $F(\Delta) \longrightarrow F(\Gamma).F(A)$. As $F(f) : F(\Delta) \longrightarrow F(\Gamma)$ and $\theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a)$ is a member of

$$\mathrm{Tm}'(F(\Delta), \sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})) = \mathrm{Tm}'(F(\Delta), \sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(f)\}).$$

So the right hand side of (28) has the correct type as well.) □

Lemma 5.1 *Suppose that $F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a cwf morphism. For $A \in \mathrm{Ty}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma)$ and $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ in $\mathcal{C}$,*

$$F(f.A) = F(f).\sigma_\Gamma(A).$$

Proof. A straightforward calculation gives

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F(f.A) & = & F(\langle f \circ \mathrm{p}_\Delta(A\{f\}), \mathrm{v}_{A\{f\}}\rangle) \\ & = & \langle F(f \circ \mathrm{p}_\Delta(A\{f\}), \theta_{\Delta.A\{f\}, A\{f\circ \mathrm{p}_\Delta(A\{f\})\}}(\mathrm{v}_{A\{f\}})\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \\ & = & \langle F(f) \circ F(\mathrm{p}_\Delta(A\{f\}), \theta_{\Delta.A\{f\}, A\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}_\Delta(A\{f\})\}}(\mathrm{v}_{A\{f\}})\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \\ & = & \langle F(f) \circ \mathrm{p}_{F\Delta}(\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})), \mathrm{v}_{\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})}\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \\ & = & \langle F(f) \circ \mathrm{p}_{F\Delta}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(f)\}), \mathrm{v}_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(f)\}}\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \\ & = & F(f).\sigma_\Gamma(A). \end{array}$$

□

The identity morphism on the cwf $\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Ty}, \mathrm{Tm})$ is given by the triple $(I_{\mathcal{C}}, \iota^{\mathcal{C}}, \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}})$ where $I_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the identity functor on $\mathcal{C}$, $\iota^{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}}$ are given by identities

$$\iota^{\mathcal{C}}_{\Gamma} = 1_{\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)}$$

and

$$\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}}_{\Gamma,A} = 1_{\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma,A)}.$$

Suppose that

$$(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Ty}, \mathrm{Tm}) \xrightarrow{(F,\sigma,\theta)} (\mathcal{C}', \mathrm{Ty}', \mathrm{Tm}') \xrightarrow{(F',\sigma',\theta')} (\mathcal{C}'', \mathrm{Ty}'', \mathrm{Tm}'')$$

are two cwf morphisms. Define their composition

$$(F', \sigma', \theta') \circ (F, \sigma, \theta) = (F' \circ F, \sigma' \circ \sigma, \theta' \circ \theta)$$

where

$$(\sigma' \circ \sigma)_{\Gamma} =_{\mathrm{def}} \sigma'_{F(\Gamma)} \circ \sigma_{\Gamma}$$

and

$$(\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Gamma,A} =_{\mathrm{def}} \theta'_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_{\Gamma}(A)} \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A}.$$

Theorem 5.3 *The cwfs and cwf morphisms form a category.*

Proof. See Appendix A. □

Note that by (23) it follows that empty context maps ε are preserved

$$F(\varepsilon_{\Theta}) = \varepsilon_{F(\Theta)}. \tag{29}$$

For morphisms $[a_1, \ldots, a_n] : \Theta \to \top.A_1.A_2.\ldots.A_n$, where

$$a_k \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Theta, A_k[a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{k-1}]),$$

as in (15) we have the following useful equation

$$\begin{array}{l} F([a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}) = \\ [\theta_{\Gamma,A_1}(a_1), \ldots, \theta_{\Gamma,A_n\{[a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_{n-1}}\}}(a_n)]_{F(\Theta);\sigma_{\top}(A_1),\ldots,\sigma_{\top.A_1.\ldots.A_{n-1}}(A_n)}, \end{array} \tag{30}$$

and dropping subscripts this reads simply

$$F([a_1, \ldots, a_n]) = [\theta(a_1), \ldots, \theta(a_n)]. \tag{31}$$

Indeed, for $n = 0$ the equation (30) is just (29). The inductive step is as follows, where (28) is used in the second equation

$$\begin{array}{l} F([a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_{n+1}}) \\ = F(\langle [a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}, a_{n+1} \rangle_{A_{n+1}}) \\ = \big\langle F([a_1, \ldots, a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}), \theta_{\Gamma,A_{n+1}\{[a_1,\ldots,a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}\}}(a_{n+1}) \big\rangle_{\sigma_{\top}.A_1.\ldots.A_n(A_{n+1})} \\ = \big\langle [\theta_{\Gamma,A_1}(a_1), \ldots, \theta_{\Gamma,A_n\{[a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_{n-1}}\}}(a_n)]_{F(\Theta);\sigma_{\top}(A_1),\ldots,\sigma_{\top.A_1.\ldots.A_{n-1}}(A_n)}, \\ \qquad \theta_{\Gamma,A_{n+1}\{[a_1,\ldots,a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}\}}(a_{n+1}) \big\rangle_{\sigma_{\top}.A_1.\ldots.A_n(A_{n+1})} \\ = \big[\theta_{\Gamma,A_1}(a_1), \ldots, \theta_{\Gamma,A_n\{[a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1}]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_{n-1}}\}}(a_n), \\ \qquad \theta_{\Gamma,A_{n+1}\{[a_1,\ldots,a_n]_{\Theta;A_1,\ldots,A_n}\}}(a_{n+1}) \big]_{F(\Theta);\sigma_{\top}(A_1),\ldots,\sigma_{\top.A_1.\ldots.A_n}(A_{n+1})} \end{array} \tag{32}$$

Remark 5.2 It follows from (26), (25) and (27) that

$$\theta(\mathsf{x}_i) = \mathsf{x}_i. \tag{33}$$

Thus

$$F(1_\Gamma) = F([\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_n]) = [\mathsf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{x}_n] = 1_\Gamma.$$

Furthermore using (16) and (26)

$$\begin{aligned} F([a_1, \ldots, a_n] \circ [b_1, \ldots, b_m]) &= [\theta(a_1[b_1, \ldots, b_m]), \ldots, \theta(a_n[b_1, \ldots, b_m])] \\ &= [\theta(a_1)\{F([b_1, \ldots, b_m])\}, \ldots, \theta(a_n)\{F([b_1, \ldots, b_m])\}] \\ &= [\theta(a_1), \ldots, \theta(a_n)] \circ F([b_1, \ldots, b_m]) \\ &= F([a_1, \ldots, a_n]) \circ F([b_1, \ldots, b_m]). \end{aligned}$$

From this follows that if $\mathcal{C}$ is a contextual category, functoriality of F is a consequence of (31) and (33).

5.5 Free cwf on a signature

Theorem 5.4 *The contexts and context maps for a fixed signature Σ form a category with families $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$.*

Proof. Let Σ be a fixed signature. We work with derivations of judgements in $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

Let $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ be a context with respect to the signature. By rule (R3) we have for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$

$$x_i : A_i \ (\Gamma)$$

Now trivially, $A_i = A_i[x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}]$ so

$$\iota_\Gamma =_{\text{def}} (x_1, \ldots, x_n) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma$$

is a context map.

Suppose that $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_m : B_m$ and $\Theta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_k : C_k$ are contexts and that

$$\bar{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_m) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta \text{ and } \bar{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_k) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Theta$$

are context maps. Thus

$$s_i : B_i[s_1, \ldots, s_{i-1}/y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}] \quad (\Gamma) \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, m) \tag{34}$$

$$t_j : C_j[t_1, \ldots, t_{j-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{j-1}] \quad (\Delta) \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, k) \tag{35}$$

By the Substitution Lemma with $\bar{s} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ applied to (35) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &t_j[s_1, \ldots, s_m/y_1, \ldots, y_m] : \\ &\qquad C_j[t_1, \ldots, t_{j-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{j-1}][s_1, \ldots, s_m/y_1, \ldots, y_m] \quad (\Gamma) \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, k) \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The types of (36) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{array}{l} C_j[t_1,\ldots,t_{j-1}/z_1,\ldots,z_{j-1}][s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m] = \\ \quad C_j[t_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_{j-1}[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]/z_1,\ldots,z_{j-1}] \end{array}$$

The vector defined by

$$\bar{t}\circ\bar{s} =_{\text{def}} \big(t_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_k[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\big)$$

is thus a context map $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Theta$, the composition of τ and σ. We have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bar{t}\circ\iota_\Delta & = & \big(t_1[y_1,\ldots,y_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_k[y_1,\ldots,y_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\big) \\ & = & (t_1,\ldots,t_k)=\bar{t} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota_\Delta\circ\bar{s} & = & \big(y_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,y_k[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\big) \\ & = & (s_1,\ldots,s_m)=\bar{s} \end{array}$$

Thus the identity rules are verified. Suppose now that

$$\Pi = w_1 : P_1,\ldots,w_\ell : P_\ell$$

is yet another context and that $\bar{p}=(p_1,\ldots,p_\ell):\Theta\longrightarrow\Pi$ is a context map.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \bar{p}\circ(\bar{t}\circ\bar{s}) & = & \bar{p}\circ\big(t_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_k[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\big) \\ & = & \big(p_1[t_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_k[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]/z_1,\ldots.z_k], \\ & & \ldots,p_\ell[t_1[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m],\ldots,t_k[s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]/z_1,\ldots.z_k]\big) \\ & = & \big(p_1[t_1,\ldots,t_k/z_1,\ldots.z_k][s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m], \\ & & \ldots,p_\ell[t_1,\ldots,t_k/z_1,\ldots.z_k][s_1,\ldots,s_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\big) \\ & = & \big(p_1[t_1,\ldots,t_k/z_1,\ldots.z_k],\ldots,p_\ell[t_1,\ldots,t_k/z_1,\ldots.z_k]\big)\circ\bar{s} \\ & = & (\bar{p}\circ\bar{t})\circ\bar{s} \end{array}$$

From this we can build a category $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma=\mathcal{F}$ consisting of contexts and context maps. The objects of the category is formally then

$$\text{Ob}\,\mathcal{F} = \{\Gamma\in\text{precontext} : (\Gamma\ \text{context})\in\mathcal{J}\}. \tag{37}$$

and arrows

$$\text{Arr}\,\mathcal{F} = \{(\Gamma,\Delta,\bar{a}) : (\bar{a}:\Gamma\longrightarrow\Delta)\in\mathcal{J}\}.$$

Composition of arrows is defined as

$$(\Gamma,\Delta,\bar{a})\circ(\Theta,\Gamma,\bar{b}) = (\Theta,\Delta,\bar{a}\circ\bar{b}).$$

The identity arrow is given by

$$1_\Gamma = (\Gamma,\Gamma,\iota_\Gamma).$$

The empty context $\langle\rangle$ is the terminal object in $\mathcal{F}$. For objects Γ, Δ we write as usual $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma, \Delta)$ for the arrows $\sigma = (\Gamma', \Delta', \bar{s})$ with $\Gamma' = \Gamma$ and $\Delta' = \Delta$ (syntactic equalities). We introduce further notation for substitution, writing

$$A[\sigma/\Delta] = A[\bar{s}/\Delta] \text{ and } a[\sigma/\Delta] = a[\bar{s}/\Delta].$$

We define a functor $\mathrm{Ty} : \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Set}$ which assigns types to contexts

$$\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma) = \{(\Gamma, A) \in \text{precontext} \times \text{pretype} : (A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}\}, \tag{38}$$

and for $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta, \Gamma)$, and $\mathrm{A} = (\Gamma, A)$ let

$$\mathrm{Ty}(\sigma)(\mathrm{A}) = (\Delta, A[\sigma/\Gamma]).$$

Note that $\mathrm{Ty}(\sigma)(\mathrm{A}) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Delta)$ by the Substitution Lemma. Clearly

$$\mathrm{Ty}(1_\Gamma)(\mathrm{A}) = (\Gamma, A[\iota_\Gamma/\Gamma]) = \mathrm{A}.$$

For $\sigma = (\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{s}) \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta, \Gamma)$ and $\tau = (\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t}) \in \mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Delta)$, where $\Delta = \langle y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_m : B_m\rangle$, we have for $\mathrm{A} = (\Theta, A)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Ty}(\sigma \circ \theta)(\mathrm{A}) &= (\Theta, A[\bar{s} \circ \bar{t}/\Gamma]) \\
&= (\Theta, A[s_1[t_1, \ldots, t_m/y_1, \ldots, y_m], \ldots, \\
&\qquad s_n[t_1, \ldots, t_m/y_1, \ldots, y_m]/x_1, \ldots, x_n]) \\
&= (\Theta, A[s_1, \ldots, s_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n][t_1, \ldots, t_m/y_1, \ldots, y_m]) \\
&= (\Theta, A[\bar{s}/\Gamma][\bar{t}/\Delta]) \\
&= \mathrm{Ty}(\theta)(\mathrm{Ty}(\sigma)(\mathrm{A})).
\end{aligned}$$

We write as is usual $\mathrm{A}\{\sigma\}$ for $\mathrm{Ty}(\sigma)(\mathrm{A})$.

For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathrm{A} = (\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, let the set of terms be

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) = \{((\Gamma, A), a) \in (\text{precontext} \times \text{pretype}) \times \text{preelement} \mid \\
(a : A\ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Define for $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta, \Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{a} = (\mathrm{A}, a) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A})$, $\mathrm{A} = (\Gamma, A)$

$$\mathrm{a}\{\sigma\} = (\mathrm{A}\{\sigma\}, a[\sigma/\Gamma]) = ((\Delta, A[\sigma/\Gamma]), a[\sigma/\Gamma]).$$

It is easily checked that $\mathrm{a}\{\sigma\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, A\{\sigma\})$, by using the Substitution Lemma, and that

$$\mathrm{a}\{1_\Gamma\} = \mathrm{a}$$

$$\mathrm{a}\{\sigma \circ \tau\} = \mathrm{a}\{\sigma\}\{\tau\} \qquad (\tau \in \mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Delta))$$

If $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\mathrm{S} = (\Gamma, S) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, define employing the fresh variable provider

$$\Gamma.\mathrm{S} =_{\mathrm{def}} \langle \Gamma, \mathrm{fresh}(\Gamma) : S\rangle$$

and

$$\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S}) =_{\mathrm{def}} (\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, \Gamma, (x_1, \ldots, x_n)).$$

Note the special cases of substitution: for $\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S}) \in \mathcal{F}(\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, \Gamma)$ and $\mathrm{A} = (\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$,

$$\mathrm{A}\{\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})\} = (\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, A[\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})/\Gamma]) = (\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, A[x_1, \ldots, x_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = (\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, A).$$

and $\mathrm{a} = (\mathrm{A}, a) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A})$,

$$\mathrm{a}\{\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})\} = ((\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, A[\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})/\Gamma]), a[\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})/\Gamma]) = ((\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, A), a) \tag{40}$$

We then introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{v}_{\Gamma,\mathrm{S}} =_{\mathrm{def}} (\mathrm{S}\{\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})\}, \mathsf{fr}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) &= ((\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, S[\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(S)/\Gamma]), \mathsf{fr}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \\ &= ((\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, S), \mathsf{fr}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

which is readily proved to be in

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{S}\{\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S})\}).$$

Then for $\sigma = (\Delta, \Gamma, (s_1, \ldots, s_n)) \in \mathcal{F}(\Delta, \Gamma)$, $\mathrm{S} = (\Gamma, S) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, and $\mathrm{a} = (\mathrm{S}, a) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, \mathrm{S}\{\sigma\})$, define

$$\langle \sigma, \mathrm{a} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}} = (\Delta, \Gamma.\mathrm{S}, (s_1, \ldots, s_n, a)).$$

which is a context morphism $\mathcal{F}(\Delta, \Gamma.\mathrm{S})$. Then for $\tau \in \mathcal{F}(\Theta, \Delta)$, we have

$$\langle \sigma, \mathrm{a} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}} \circ \tau = \langle \sigma \circ \tau, \mathrm{a}\{\tau\} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}}.$$

Moreover

$$\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S}) \circ \langle \sigma, \mathrm{a} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}} = \sigma$$

and

$$\mathsf{v}_{\Gamma,\mathrm{S}}\{\langle \sigma, \mathrm{a} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}}\} = \mathrm{a}$$

and finally

$$1_{\Gamma,\mathrm{S}} = \langle \mathrm{p}_\Gamma(\mathrm{S}), \mathsf{v}_{\Gamma,\mathrm{S}} \rangle_{\mathrm{S}}.$$

□

Lemma 5.3 *Suppose that Σ is a signature, and that $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ is a fresh sequence of variables for Σ. If (Γ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, then variable ordering σ for Γ forms a context map*

$$(\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

whose inverse $(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, is given by $\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. See Appendix A. □

We can now prove a result about variable standardization for judgements, as a corollary to Lemma 5.3.

Corollary 5.5 *Suppose that Σ is a signature, and that $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ is a fresh sequence of variables for Σ. Then*

(a) if $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*, then* $(\Gamma^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*,*

(b) if $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*, then*

$$(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \Longleftrightarrow (A[\mathrm{s}(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ type } (\Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

(c) if $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*, then*

$$(a : A\ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \Longleftrightarrow (a[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\ (\Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

(d) if Γ *is a precontext with respect to* Σ*, and* $(\Gamma^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*, then* $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*.*

Proof. As for (a): If $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, then by Lemma 5.3,

$$(\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma). \tag{42}$$

In particular $(\Gamma^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

As for (b): By Lemma 5.3 and the Substitution lemma we obtain

$$(A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ type } (\Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

as required. The converse is obtained by applying the inverse substitution $\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma$.

As for (c): By Lemma 5.3 and the Substitution lemma again we get

$$(a[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\ (\Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma).$$

The converse is obtained by applying the inverse substitution.

As for (d): Induction on derivations. For $\Gamma = \langle\rangle$ the statement is trivial. Suppose $\Gamma, x : A$ is a precontext. Hence $x \in \mathrm{Fresh}(\Gamma)$ and Γ is a precontext. If $((\Gamma, x : A)^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, then with shorter derivations $(\Gamma^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and $(A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ type } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. By inductive hypothesis, $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. We can apply Lemma 5.3, and by (b) obtain, $(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Now as $x \in \mathrm{Fresh}(\Gamma)$, we get $(\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ as required. □

This shows that all judgements can be derived using the standard order of variables given by the next fresh variable operation.

Remark 5.4 The cwf $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ defined in Theorem 5.4 is in general not contextual, unless we restrict the fresh variable provider. Consider a signature with a constant type T. Then $\langle y : T\rangle$ is a context for any variable y when $\varphi = \varphi_\infty$, but unless $y = \mathsf{fr}_\infty()$, this context can never be written as an extension of the terminal object in $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$.

To obtain a contextual cwf we consider the fresh variable provider φ_1, fr_1 and $V = \mathbb{N}_+$. In effect this just calling the nth variable in the context, n. Indeed note that then any context Γ in $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ has the form

$$1 : A_1, \ldots, n : A_n.$$

The ith projection is, by (40) and (41)

$$\mathsf{x}_i = \mathrm{v}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-i)}\} = ((\Gamma, A_i), i). \tag{43}$$

By this remark we can easily see that

Theorem 5.6 *The contexts and context maps for a fixed signature Σ, where the fvp is of de Bruijn type, form a contextual category with families $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$.* $\square$

5.6 Grading the free cwf by proof height

The components of $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ have a natural grading based on height of derivations. We introduce graded versions of (37), (38) and (39) using (7) as follows. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

- $\mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma = \mathrm{Ob}_n \mathcal{F}_\Sigma = \{\Gamma \in \text{precontext} \mid (\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma)\}$.
- For $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$,

$$\mathrm{Ty}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma) = \{(\Gamma, A) \in \text{precontext} \times \text{pretype} \mid (A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma)\},$$

- For $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$, $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma)$,

$$\mathrm{Tm}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) = \{((\Gamma, A), a) \in (\text{precontext} \times \text{pretype}) \times \text{preelement} \mid (a : A\ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma)\}.$$

Each of these sets is monotone in n, i.e. for $m < n$ we have

- $\mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma \subseteq \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$,
- $\mathrm{Ty}_m^\Sigma(\Gamma) \subseteq \mathrm{Ty}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma)$ for $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$,
- $\mathrm{Tm}_m^\Sigma(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) \subseteq \mathrm{Tm}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma, \mathrm{A})$ for $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$, and $(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) \in \mathrm{Ty}_m^\Sigma(\Gamma)$.

We note that these sets have the following presupposition like properties:

(P1) If $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$, then either $\Gamma = \langle\rangle$, or $\Gamma = \langle \Gamma', u : C \rangle$ with $n > 0$ and $\Gamma' \in \mathrm{Ob}_{n-1}^\Sigma$ and $(\Gamma', C) \in \mathrm{Ty}_{n-1}^\Sigma(\Gamma')$.

(P2) If $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma)$ where $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$, then $n > 0$ and there is a unique declaration $(\Delta, \bar{i}, S) \in \Sigma$ and a unique $(\bar{t} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma)$, so that $A = S(\bar{t})$. Thus $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_{n-1}^\Sigma$, $\Delta \in \mathrm{Ob}_{n-1}^\Sigma$ and if $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_r : B_r$, then for $k = 1, \ldots, r$:

$$t_k : B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma).$$

Then by Theorem 3.8, $B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]$ type $(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma)$.

(P3) If $((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma, \mathrm{A})$ where $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_n^\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^\Sigma$, then $n > 0$ and there is a unique declaration $(\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$ and unique $(\bar{t} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma)$, so that $a = f(\bar{t})$ and $A = U[\bar{t}/\Delta]$. Thus $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_{n-1}^\Sigma$, $\Delta \in \mathrm{Ob}_{n-1}^\Sigma$ and if $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_r : B_r$, then for $k = 1, \ldots, r$:

$$t_k : B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma).$$

Again by Theorem 3.8, $B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]$ type $(\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma)$.

6 Models for signatures and extension problems

We use a functorial definition of a model for a signature, and then show how it relates to model defined by specifying the component of the signature.

In this section *we consider only signatures Σ on standard form, over symbol systems where the fresh variable provider is φ_1, fr_1.* Thus according to Theorem 5.6, $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ will be a contextual cwf.

6.1 Models for type systems

A *model of a type system* over the signature Σ is a cwf morphism $(F, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ into some cwf $\mathcal{C}$. Such models are determined by their values on the component of the signature (Lemma 6.1). To see this we first use Definition 5.2 to spell out the meaning of $(F, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ being a cwf morphism, by considering judgements in $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$:

(M1) If (Γ context) $\in \mathcal{J}$, then $F(\Gamma) \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$.

(M2) If (A type (Γ)) $\in \mathcal{J}$, then $\sigma_\Gamma(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_\mathcal{C}(F(\Gamma))$.

(M3) If $(a : A\ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}$, then $\theta_{\Gamma,A}((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}_\mathcal{C}(F(\Gamma), \sigma_\Gamma(\Gamma, A))$.

We drop the subscripts from σ and θ below.

For $(\bar{b} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}$, we have

(M4) if $(A$ type $(\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}$, then $\sigma(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \sigma(\Gamma, A)\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$,

(M5) if $(a : A\ (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}$, then $\theta(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma], a[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \theta(\Gamma, A, a)\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$,

(M6) if $\bar{b} = b_1, \ldots, b_n$ and $\Gamma = x_1 : B_1, \ldots, x_n : B_n$ then

$$F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}) = [\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)].$$

We introduce the notation

$$\bar{\theta}(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}) =_{\text{def}} [\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)].$$

Moreover we have

(M7) if $(x_i : A_i\ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n)) \in \mathcal{J}$,

$$\theta(\langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n\rangle, A_i, x_i) = \mathsf{x}_i.$$

As particular cases of (M4) and (M5) we have, letting $\bar{x} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)$,

(M8) for $(\Gamma, S) \in \Sigma$, $\sigma(\Delta, S(\bar{b})) = \sigma(\Gamma, S(\bar{x}))\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$,

(M9) for $(\Gamma, f, U) \in \Sigma$, $\theta(\Delta, U[\bar{b}/\Gamma], f(\bar{b})) = \theta(\Gamma, U, f(\bar{x}))\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$.

The following notation is commonplace

$[\![\Gamma]\!]^F = F(\Gamma)$,

$[\![A \text{ type } (\Gamma)]\!]^F = \sigma(\Gamma, A)$,

$[\![a : A\ (\Gamma)]\!]^F = \theta(\Gamma, A, a)$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let Σ be a signature on standard form. Suppose that $(F, \sigma, \theta), (F', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ are two cwf morphisms with*

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\Gamma) &= F'(\Gamma) && ((\Gamma, S) \in \Sigma \text{ or } (\Gamma, f, U) \in \Sigma)\\
\sigma(\Gamma, S(\check{\Gamma})) &= \sigma'(\Gamma, S(\check{\Gamma})) && ((\Gamma, S) \in \Sigma)\\
\sigma(\Gamma, U) &= \sigma'(\Gamma, U) && ((\Gamma, f, U) \in \Sigma)\\
\theta(\Gamma, U, f(\check{\Gamma})) &= \theta'(\Gamma, U, f(\check{\Gamma})) && ((\Gamma, f, U) \in \Sigma)
\end{aligned}$$

Then $(F, \sigma, \theta) = (F', \sigma', \theta')$.

Proof. Induction on the grading n of Ob^Σ_n, Ty^Σ_n and Tm^Σ_n. We prove that for all n:

(a) $F(\Gamma) = F'(\Gamma)$ for $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}^\Sigma_n$

(b) $\sigma(\Gamma, A) = \sigma'(\Gamma, A)$ for $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}^\Sigma_n$ and $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}^\Sigma_n(\Gamma)$

(c) $\theta(\Gamma, A, a) = \theta'(\Gamma, A, a)$ for $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}^\Sigma_m$, $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}^\Sigma_n(\Gamma)$, and $((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}^\Sigma_n(\Gamma, A)$.

$n = 0$: We have $F(\langle\rangle) = \top_\mathcal{C} = F'(\langle\rangle)$ so since $\mathrm{Ob}^\Sigma_0 = \{\langle\rangle\}$, F and F' are equal on this set. The sets Ty^Σ_0 and Tm^Σ_0 are empty so trivially σ and σ', and θ and θ' agree on these sets respectively. Thus (a) – (c) holds for $n = 0$.

$n = m + 1$: Assume as inductive hypothesis that (a) – (c) holds for $n = m$. Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}^\Sigma_{m+1}$. Thus either $\Gamma = \langle\rangle$ or $\Gamma = \langle\Gamma', x : A\rangle$. In the first

case, $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_0^\Sigma$, and $F(\Gamma) = F'(\Gamma)$ by the base case. In the second case we have according to (P1) above that $\Gamma' \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$ and $(\Gamma', C) \in \mathrm{Ty}_m^\Sigma(\Gamma')$. Thus by the inductive hypothesis

$$F(\langle \Gamma', x : A\rangle) = F(\Gamma).\sigma(\Gamma', A) = F'(\Gamma).\sigma'(\Gamma', A) = F'(\langle \Gamma', x : A\rangle).$$

Thus (a) is proved for $n = m + 1$.

Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_{m+1}^\Sigma$ and $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_{m+1}^\Sigma(\Gamma)$. By (P2) above there is a unique declaration $(\Delta, \bar{i}, S) \in \Sigma$ and a unique $(\bar{t} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}_m(\Sigma)$, so that $A = S(\bar{t})$. Thus $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$, $\Delta \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$ and writing $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_r : B_r$, we have for $k = 1, \ldots, r$:

$$t_k : B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_m(\Sigma)$$

and

$$B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ \mathrm{type}\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_m(\Sigma).$$

By the induction hypothesis (b) for m we have

$$\sigma(\Gamma, B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]) = \sigma'(\Gamma, B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]) \quad (k = 1, \ldots, n). \tag{44}$$

By inductive hypothesis (c) for m we then have

$$[\theta(\Gamma, B_1, t_1), \ldots, \theta(\Gamma, B_n[\bar{t}^{n-1}/\Delta^{n-1}], t_n)] = [\theta'(\Gamma, B_1, t_1), \ldots, \theta'(\Gamma, B_n[\bar{t}^{n-1}/\Delta^{n-1}], t_n)]$$

so

$$\bar{\theta}(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t}) = \bar{\theta}'(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t}). \tag{45}$$

Now

$$\begin{array}{rcll}
\sigma(\Gamma, A) & = & \sigma(\Delta, S(\check{\Delta})\{\bar{\theta}(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & ((\mathrm{M6}) \text{ and } (\mathrm{M8})) \\
& = & \sigma'(\Delta, S(\check{\Delta}))\{\bar{\theta}(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & (\text{by (ii)}) \\
& = & \sigma'(\Delta, S(\check{\Delta}))\{\bar{\theta}'(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & (45) \\
& = & \sigma'(\Gamma, A). & ((\mathrm{M6}) \text{ and } (\mathrm{M8}))
\end{array}$$

Thus (b) is proved for $n = m + 1$.

Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_{m+1}^\Sigma$, $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_{m+1}^\Sigma(\Gamma)$ and $((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}_{m+1}^\Sigma(\Gamma, A)$. By (P3) there is a unique declaration $(\Delta, f, \bar{i}, U) \in \Sigma$ and unique $(\bar{t} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}_{n-1}(\Sigma)$, so that $a = f(\bar{t})$ and $A = U[\bar{t}/\Delta]$. Thus $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$, $\Delta \in \mathrm{Ob}_m^\Sigma$ and writing $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_r : B_r$, we have for $k = 1, \ldots, r$:

$$t_k : B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_m(\Sigma)$$

and

$$B_k[\bar{t}^{k-1}/\Delta^{k-1}]\ \mathrm{type}\ (\Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}_m(\Sigma).$$

As above the inductive hypothesis (b) and (c) for m gives (44) and (45).

$$\begin{array}{rcll}
\theta(\Gamma, A, a) & = & \theta(\Delta, U, f(\bar{x}))\{\bar{\theta}(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & \\
& = & \theta'(\Delta, U, f(\bar{x}))\{\bar{\theta}(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & (\text{by (iv)}) \\
& = & \theta'(\Delta, U, f(\bar{x}))\{\bar{\theta}'(\Gamma, \Delta, \bar{t})\} & (45) \\
& = & \theta'(\Gamma, A, a). &
\end{array}$$

This proves (c) for (m+1). □

The following result show that it is enough to specify the values on objects of $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ to define a cwf morphism $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

Theorem 6.1 *Suppose that F, σ and θ are assignments that satisfy (M1) – (M3), (M7) and that for $(\bar{b} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,*

(M8') for all $(\Gamma, S) \in \Sigma$, $\sigma(\Delta, S(\bar{b})) = \sigma(\Gamma, S(\bar{x}))\{\bar{\theta}(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$,

(M9') for all $(\Gamma, f, U) \in \Sigma$, $\theta(\Delta, U[\bar{b}/\Gamma], f(\bar{b})) = \theta(\Gamma, U, f(\bar{x}))\{\bar{\theta}(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b})\}$.

Then letting

$$F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}) = \bar{\theta}(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}), \tag{46}$$

we obtain a cwf morphism $(F, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$.

Proof. By induction on the height of derivations one shows that (M8') and (M9') implies (M4) and (M5). Suppose that for all $m < k$, we have for any $(\bar{b} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, $\Gamma = x_1 : B_1, \ldots, x_n : B_n$

(M4') if $\vdash_m A$ type (Γ),

$$\sigma(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \sigma(\Gamma, A)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\},$$

(M5') if $\vdash_m a : A$ (Γ),

$$\theta(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma], a[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \theta(\Gamma, A, a)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\},$$

Ad (M4'): Suppose $\vdash_k A$ type (Γ). Thus $A = S(a_1, \ldots, a_p)$, for some $(\Theta, S) \in \Sigma$ with

$$\vdash_{\bar{r}} (a_1, \ldots, a_p) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Theta \tag{47}$$

and $\bar{r} < k$. Assume $\Theta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_p : C_p$ and write $\bar{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_p$, then by (47),

$$\vdash_{r_{i+2}} a_i : C_i[\bar{a}^{i-1}/\Theta^{i-1}] \ (\Gamma) \tag{48}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Then applying substitution $\bar{b}$,

$$a_i[\bar{b}/\Gamma] : C_i[\bar{a}^{i-1}/\Theta^{i-1}][\bar{b}/\Gamma] \ (\Delta). \tag{49}$$

i.e.

$$a_i[\bar{b}/\Gamma] : C_i[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_{i-1}[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}] \ (\Delta). \tag{50}$$

So

$$(a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Theta \tag{51}$$

We have

$$\sigma(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \sigma(\Delta, S(a_1, \ldots, a_p)[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \sigma(\Delta, S(a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]))$$

By (M8') and (51) the right hand side is

$$\sigma(\Theta, S(\bar{z}))\{[\theta(\Delta, C_1, a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma]), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, C_p[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_{p-1}[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma])]\}$$

which is

$$\sigma(\Theta, S(\bar{z}))\{[\theta(\Delta, C_1, a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma]), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, C_p[a_1, \ldots, a_{p-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}][\bar{b}/\Gamma], a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma])]\}$$

By (47) using $C_1 = C_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma]$ we can apply the inductive hypothesis to get

$$\sigma(\Theta, S(\bar{z}))\Big\{[\theta(\Gamma, C_1, a_1)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\},$$
$$\ldots,$$
$$\theta(\Gamma, C_p[a_1, \ldots, a_{p-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\}]\Big\}$$

By distributivity and functoriality we obtain this expression

$$\sigma(\Theta, S(\bar{z}))\Big\{[\theta(\Gamma, C_1, a_1), \ldots, \theta(\Gamma, C_p[a_1, \ldots, a_{p-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p)]\Big\}$$
$$\Big\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\Big\}$$

Then using (M8') again we obtain

$$\sigma(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) = \sigma(\Gamma, S(a_1, \ldots, a_p))\Big\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\Big\}$$

But since $A = S(a_1, \ldots, a_p)$ this is what was required. We have proved (M4') for k.

Ad (M5'): Suppose $\vdash_k a : A\ (\Gamma)$, Thus $a = f(a_1, \ldots, a_p)$ and $A = U[a_1, \ldots, a_p/z_1, \ldots, z_p]$ for some $(\Theta, f, U) \in \Sigma$ with

$$\vdash_{\bar{r}} (a_1, \ldots, a_p) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Theta \tag{52}$$

and $\bar{r} < k$, where $\Theta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_p : C_p$. Write $\bar{a} = a_1, \ldots, a_p$, then by (52),

$$\vdash_{r_{i+2}} a_i : C_i[\bar{a}^{i-1}/\Theta^{i-1}]\ (\Gamma) \tag{53}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Then applying substitution $\bar{b}$,

$$a_i[\bar{b}/\Gamma] : C_i[\bar{a}^{i-1}/\Theta^{i-1}][\bar{b}/\Gamma]\ (\Delta). \tag{54}$$

i.e.

$$a_i[\bar{b}/\Gamma] : C_i[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_{i-1}[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{i-1}]\ (\Delta). \tag{55}$$

So

$$(a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) : \Delta \longrightarrow \Theta \tag{56}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta(\Delta, U[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) \\
&= \theta(\Delta, U[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], f(a_1, \ldots, a_p)[\bar{b}/\Gamma]) \\
&= \theta(\Delta, U[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], f(a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma])).
\end{aligned}$$

By (M9') and (56) the last expression equals

$$\theta(\Theta, U, f(\bar{z}))\{[\theta(\Delta, C_1, a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma]), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, C_p[a_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma], \ldots, a_{p-1}[\bar{b}/\Gamma]/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p[\bar{b}/\Gamma])]\}$$

By (52) using $C_1 = C_1[\bar{b}/\Gamma]$ we can apply the inductive hypothesis to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta(\Theta, U, f(\bar{z}))\Big\{[\theta(\Gamma, C_1, a_1)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\},\\ &\ldots,\\ &\theta(\Gamma, C_p[a_1, \ldots, a_{p-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p)\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\}]\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

By distributivity and functoriality we obtain this expression

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta(\Theta, U, f(\bar{z}))\Big\{[\theta(\Gamma, C_1, a_1), \ldots, \theta(\Gamma, C_p[a_1, \ldots, a_{p-1}/z_1, \ldots, z_{p-1}], a_p)]\Big\}\\ &\Big\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

Then using (M9') again we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta(\Delta, A[\bar{b}/\Gamma], a[\bar{b}/\Gamma])\\ &= \theta(\Gamma, U[a_1, \ldots, a_p/z_1, \ldots, z_p], f(a_1, \ldots, a_p))\Big\{[\theta(\Delta, B_1, b_1), \ldots, \theta(\Delta, B_n[\bar{b}^{n-1}/\Gamma^{n-1}], b_n)]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

But since $a = f(a_1, \ldots, a_p)$ and $A = U[a_1, \ldots, a_p/z_1, \ldots, z_p]$ this is what was required. We have proved (M5') for k.

The definition (46) then gives a functor according to Remark 5.2. □

For two signatures with $\Sigma \subseteq \Sigma'$ there is a canonical embedding $E : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'}$ given by letting $E = (E, \sigma, \theta)$ be the identity on all input

$$\begin{aligned}E(\Gamma) &= \Gamma,\\ E(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}) &= (\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{b}),\\ \sigma_\Gamma(\mathrm{A}) &= \mathrm{A},\\ \theta_{\Gamma,A}(\mathrm{a}) &= \mathrm{a}.\end{aligned}$$

The conditions follows readily since by Lemma 3.4, $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$.

6.2 Extension problem for signatures

The *extension problem* is given a cwf morphism $G = (G, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$, a signature Σ' including Σ, and some suitable data in $\mathcal{C}$, find a cwf morphism $G' = (G', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \to \mathcal{C}$ mapping the new syntactic entities to this data and such that $G' \circ E = G$, where E is the canonical cwf embedding $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'}$.

We have the following general main cases of the extension problem:

Theorem 6.2 *Given a signature Σ and a cwf morphism $G = (G, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$. Moreover suppose that S is a type symbol not declared in Σ and $(\Gamma_S \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, so that $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{(\Gamma_S, S)\}$ is a signature. For $A \in \mathrm{Ty}_{\mathcal{C}}(G(\Gamma_S))$, there is a unique cwf morphism $G' = (G', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \to \mathcal{C}$ with $G' \circ E = G$ and*

$$\sigma'(\Gamma_S, S(\bar{x})) = A,$$

where $\bar{x} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_S)$.

Proof. First we observe that uniqueness is direct by Lemma 6.1. If G'' is another cwf morphism $\mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \to \mathcal{C}$ with $G'' \circ E = G$ and $\sigma'(\Gamma_S, S(\bar{x})) = A$, then G'' and G' agree on the signature, so by this lemma $G'' = G'$.

We are going to define approximations of (G', σ', θ') for each maximum proof height $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$G'_n : \mathrm{Ob}_n^{\Sigma'} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C},$$

$$\sigma'_n : \mathrm{Ty}_n^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ty}^{\mathcal{C}}(G'_n(\Gamma)) \text{ for } \Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^{\Sigma'},$$

$$\theta'_n : \mathrm{Tm}_n^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tm}^{\mathcal{C}}(G'_n(\Gamma), \sigma'_n(\Gamma, A)) \text{ for } \Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_n^{\Sigma'},\ (\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_n^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma).$$

Suppose that these G'_k, σ'_k and θ'_k have the properties that for any $p < k$,

(I1) $G'_p(\Gamma) = G'_k(\Gamma)$ for all $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_p^{\Sigma'}$,

(I2) $\sigma'_p(\Gamma, A) = \sigma'_k(\Gamma, A)$ for all $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_p^{\Sigma'}$, $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_p^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma)$,

(I3) $\theta'_p((\Gamma, A), a) = \theta'_k((\Gamma, A), a)$ for all $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_p^{\Sigma'}$, $(\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_p^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma)$, $((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}_p^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A})$.

Then these independence properties imply that the following are well defined:

$$G'(\Gamma) = G'_k(\Gamma), \text{ where } \Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_k^{\Sigma'},$$

$$\sigma'(\Gamma, A) = \sigma'_k(\Gamma, A), \text{ where } \Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_k^{\Sigma'},\ (\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_k^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma),$$

$$\theta'((\Gamma, A), a) = \theta'_k((\Gamma, A), a), \text{ where } \Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}_k^{\Sigma'},\ (\Gamma, A) \in \mathrm{Ty}_k^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma),\ ((\Gamma, A), a) \in \mathrm{Tm}_k^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}).$$

Note that $\mathrm{Ob}_0^{\Sigma'} = \{\langle\rangle\}$ but $\mathrm{Ty}_n^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma) = \emptyset$ and $\mathrm{Tm}_n^{\Sigma'}(\Gamma, \mathrm{A}) = \emptyset$. We define $G'_0(\langle\rangle) = \top$ and let σ'_0 and θ_0 be the unique functions with empty domain.

Now define functions on level $n + 1$:

- $G'_{n+1}(\langle\rangle) = \top$,
- $G'_{n+1}(\Gamma, u : C) = G'_n(\Gamma).\sigma'_n(\Gamma, C)$ for $(\Gamma, u : C \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}_{n+1}(\Sigma')$,
- $\sigma'_{n+1}(\Delta, S(\bar{t})) = A\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_S, \bar{t})\Big\}$ where $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_S) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$,

- $\sigma'_{n+1}(\Delta, T(\bar{t})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_T, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $T \neq S$ and $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_T) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_T, T) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_T)$,
- $\theta'_{n+1}(\Delta, C_i, z_i) = \mathsf{x}_i$ if $\Delta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_m : C_m$, if ($\Delta$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$,
- $\theta'_{n+1}(\Delta, U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f], f(\bar{t})) = \theta(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_f, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_f) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$, $(U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f]$ type $(\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_f, f, U_f) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_f)$.

Note that by properties (P1) – (P3) the above recursive definition is well-defined. The independence properties (I1) – (I3) are now verified by induction on k. By the indepedence properties we have now

(G1) $G'(\langle\rangle) = \top$,

(G2) $G'(\Gamma, u : C) = G'(\Gamma).\sigma'(\Gamma, C)$ for $(\Gamma, u : C$ context$) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G3) $\sigma'(\Delta, S(\bar{t})) = A\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_S, \bar{t})\Big\}$ where $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_S) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G4) $\sigma'(\Delta, T(\bar{t})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_T, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $T \neq S$ and $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_T) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_T, T) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_T)$,

(G5) $\theta'(\Delta, C_i, z_i) = \mathsf{x}_i$ if $\Delta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_m : C_m$, and ($\Delta$ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G6) $\theta'(\Delta, U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f], f(\bar{t})) = \theta(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_f, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_f) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$, $(U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f]$ type $(\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_f, f, U_f) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_f)$.

Note that using identity maps in the above we get

$$\sigma'(\Gamma_S, S(\bar{x})) = A \tag{57}$$

$$\sigma'(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y})) \qquad T \neq S \tag{58}$$

$$\theta'(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{y})) = \theta(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{y})) \tag{59}$$

We now show that this extends to a cwf morphism $(G', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ by checking the conditions of Theorem 6.1. Conditions (M1) – (M3) are clear by the above, condition (M7) is true by definition. We need to check the remaining (M8') and (M9').

(M8'): This follows from (61) and (G3) for the case S and from (62) and (G4) for the general case.

(M9'): This follows from (59) and (G6).

Hence by Theorem 6.1, there is a cwf morphism $G' : \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. We need to check that $G' \circ E = G$ and $\sigma'(\Gamma_S, S(\bar{x})) = A$. The latter follows by (61) and the former follows by Lemma 6.1 and (62) and (59). $\square$

Theorem 6.3 *Given a signature Σ and a cwf morphism $G = (G, \sigma, \theta) : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$. Moreover suppose that f is a function symbol not declared in Σ, and $(U_f \text{ type } (\Gamma_f)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_f)$ so that $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{(\Gamma_f, f, U_f)\}$ is a signature. For $a \in \mathrm{Tm}_{\mathcal{C}}(G(\Gamma_f), \sigma_{\Gamma_f}(\Gamma_f, U_f))$, there is a unique cwf morphism $G' = (G', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \to \mathcal{C}$ with $G' \circ E = G$ and*

$$\theta'(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{x})) = a,$$

where $\bar{x} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_f)$.

Proof. Uniqueness follows as in Theorem 6.2 by Lemma 6.1.

As in Theorem 6.2, we define $G'_0(\langle\rangle) = \top$ and let σ'_0 and θ_0 be the unique functions with empty domain. Define functions on level $n+1$:

- $G'_{n+1}(\langle\rangle) = \top$,
- $G'_{n+1}(\Gamma, u : C) = G'_n(\Gamma).\sigma'_n(\Gamma, C)$ for $(\Gamma, u : C \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}_{n+1}(\Sigma')$,
- $\sigma'_{n+1}(\Delta, T(\bar{t})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_T, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_T) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_T, T) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_T)$,
- $\theta'_{n+1}(\Delta, C_i, z_i) = \mathsf{x}_i$ if $\Delta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_m : C_m$, and $(\Delta \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$,
- $\theta'_{n+1}(\Delta, U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f], f(\bar{t})) = a\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_f, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_f) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$
- $\theta'_{n+1}(\Delta, U_g[\bar{t}/\Gamma_g], g(\bar{t})) = \theta(\Gamma_g, U_g, g(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}_n(\Delta, \Gamma_g, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_f) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$, $(U_g[\bar{t}/\Gamma_g] \text{ type } (\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}_n(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_g, g, U_g) \in \Sigma$, $g \neq f$ and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_g)$.

Similarly to Theorem 6.2 we construct (G', σ', θ') so that

(G1) $G'(\langle\rangle) = \top$

(G2) $G'(\Gamma, u : C) = G'(\Gamma).\sigma'(\Gamma, C)$, for $(\Gamma, u : C \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G3) $\sigma'(\Delta, T(\bar{t})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_T, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_T) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_T, T) \in \Sigma$, and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_T)$.

(G4) $\theta'(\Delta, C_i, z_i) = \mathsf{x}_i$ if $\Delta = z_1 : C_1, \ldots, z_m : C_m$, and $(\Delta \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G5) $\theta'(\Delta, U_f[\bar{t}/\Gamma_f], f(\bar{t})) = a\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_f, \bar{t})\Big\}$, if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_f) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$,

(G6) $\theta'(\Delta, U_g[\bar{t}/\Gamma_g], g(\bar{t})) = \theta(\Gamma_g, U_g, g(\bar{y}))\Big\{\bar{\theta'}(\Delta, \Gamma_g, \bar{t})\Big\}$ if $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_g) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ and $(\Gamma_g, g, U_g) \in \Sigma$, $g \neq f$ and where $\bar{y} = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_g)$.

The verification of the properties of G' is also similar to Theorem 6.2. Using identity maps in the above we get

$$\sigma'(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y})) = \sigma(\Gamma_T, T(\bar{y})) \tag{60}$$

$$\theta'(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{x})) = a \tag{61}$$

$$\theta'(\Gamma_g, U_g, g(\bar{y})) = \theta(\Gamma_g, U_g, g(\bar{y})) \qquad \text{for } g \neq f \tag{62}$$

We show that this extends to a cwf morphism $(G', \sigma', \theta') : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \to \mathcal{C}$ by checking the conditions of Theorem 6.1. Conditions (M1) – (M3) are clear by the above, condition (M7) is true by definition. We need to check the remaining (M8') and (M9').

(M8'): this follows from (60) and (G3).

(M9'): this is a consequence of (61) and (62) using respectively (G5) and (G6).

Hence by Theorem 6.1, there is a cwf morphism $G' : \mathcal{F}_{\Sigma'} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$. We check that $G' \circ E = G$ and $\theta'(\Gamma_f, U_f, f(\bar{x})) = a$. The latter follows by (61), and the former is a consequence of Lemma 6.1 using (60) and (62). □

7 Hyperdoctrines over CwFs

We introduce a logical structure of propositions over the type structure provided by cwfs using the technique of hyperdoctrines (cf. Seely 1983).

Recall that a *Heyting algebra* is a reflexive, transitive order $\leq$ with operations $\wedge, \vee, \to$ and constants $\bot, \top$ such that for all x, y, z

(a) $\bot \leq x \leq \top$,

(b) $z \leq x \wedge y$ iff $z \leq x$ and $z \leq y$,

(c) $x \vee y \leq z$ iff $x \leq z$ and $y \leq z$,

(d) $z \leq (x \to y)$ iff $z \wedge x \leq y$.

Note that we are not requiring $\leq$ to be antisymmetric, so we should probably say Heyting prealgebras rather than Heyting algebras. A morphism between Heyting algebras is an order preserving homomorphism which respect to the operations and constants.

We suggest a natural generalization of hyperdoctrines to dependent types: semantics of first-order logic over a cwf can given by the following data

1. A category with families $\mathcal{C}$.

2. A functor $\mathrm{Pr} : \mathcal{C}^{op} \longrightarrow$ Heyting into the category of Heyting algebras. For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ we write
$$R\{f\} =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Pr}(f)(R).$$

3. For any $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ and $S \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ monotone operations $\forall_S, \exists_S : \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$ such that

(a) For $Q \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$, $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$,

$$Q \leq \forall_S(R) \iff Q\{\mathrm{p}(S)\} \leq R$$

(b) For $Q \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$, $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$,

$$\exists_S(R) \leq Q \iff R \leq Q\{\mathrm{p}(S)\}.$$

4. For the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Delta.S\{f\} & \xrightarrow{f.S} & \Gamma.S \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}(S\{f\})}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{p}(S)} \\ \Delta & \xrightarrow[f]{} & \Gamma \end{array} \tag{63}$$

we have for $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$,

(a) $\forall_S(R)\{f\} = \forall_{S\{f\}}(R\{f.S\})$,

(b) $\exists_S(R)\{f\} = \exists_{S\{f\}}(R\{f.S\})$.

The resulting structure $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}, \forall, \exists)$ is called a *first-order hyperdoctrine over* $\mathcal{C}$. Write $\mathcal{C}^{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}} = \mathrm{Pr}$. It is also meaningful to consider fragments of first-order logic:

- *cwf with Horn doctrine*: Pr is a contravariant functor into the category of lower semi lattices and we drop conditions (3) and (4).
- *cwf with regular doctrine*: Pr is a contravariant functor into the category of lower semi lattices and we drop conditions (3a) and (4a) and add the *Frobenius condition:* For $Q \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$, $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$,

$$Q \wedge \exists_S(R) \leq \exists_S(Q\{\mathrm{p}(S)\} \wedge R) \tag{64}$$

(cf. Johnstone (2002)).

- *cwf with coherent doctrine*: this is a cwf with regular doctrine, but Pr is a contravariant functor into the category of *distributive lattices*.

Suppose that $F : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}'$ is a cwf morphism. Assume that $\mathcal{H} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}, \forall, \exists)$ and $\mathcal{H}' = (\mathcal{C}', \mathrm{Pr}', \forall', \exists')$ are two hyperdoctrines over the respective cwfs. An *F-based morphism of hyperdoctrines*

$$G : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}'$$

is a natural transformation $G : \mathrm{Pr} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pr}' \circ F$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{G_\Gamma} & \mathrm{Pr}'(F\Gamma) \\ {\scriptstyle _\{f\}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle _\{Ff\}} \\ \mathrm{Pr}(\Delta) & \xrightarrow[G_\Delta]{} & \mathrm{Pr}'(F\Delta) \end{array}$$

such that for $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$,

1. $G_\Gamma(\forall_S(R)) = \forall'_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G_{\Gamma.S}(R))$,
2. $G_\Gamma(\exists_S(R)) = \exists'_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G_{\Gamma.S}(R))$.

7.1 Horn logic in any cwf

We note that a canonical Horn doctrine arises from every cwf by a propositions-as-types interpretation. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf. Define for $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\mathrm{Pr}^\wedge_\mathcal{C}(\Gamma) = (\mathrm{F}(\Gamma), \leq)$$

where $\mathrm{F}(\Gamma)$ consists of all finite sequences $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle$ of types in $\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, which are ordered by $\leq_\Gamma$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle \iff \\ \forall k = 1, \ldots m,\ \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A_1.A_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.A_n\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}\}, B_k\{\mathrm{p}^{(n)}\}) \text{ is inhabited.} \end{array}$$

For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$, let

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle\{f\} = \langle A_1\{f\}, \ldots, A_n\{f\}\rangle. \tag{65}$$

The semilattice structure is given by $\top_\Gamma = \langle\rangle$ and

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \wedge_\Gamma \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle.$$

Theorem 7.1 *For any cwf $\mathcal{C}$, the pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}^\wedge_\mathcal{C})$ constructed above is a cwf with Horn doctrine.*

Proof. We show that $\mathrm{Pr}^\wedge_\mathcal{C}$ is a lower semilattice. The element $\top_\Gamma$ is obviously the top element. To see that the relation is reflexive we note that

$$\mathsf{v}_{A_k\{\mathrm{p}^{(k-1)}\}}\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-k)}\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A_1.A_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.A_n\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}\}, A_k\{\mathrm{p}^{(n)}\})$$

for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. This also proves that for each k

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle A_k\rangle. \tag{66}$$

Suppose that $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle$ and $\langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle C_1, \ldots, C_p\rangle$. Suppose that these relations are witnessed by

$$b_k \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A_1.A_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.A_n\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}\}, B_k\{\mathrm{p}^{(n)}\})$$

$$c_k \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B_1.B_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.B_m\{\mathrm{p}^{(m-1)}\}, C_\ell\{\mathrm{p}^{(m)}\}).$$

Now

$$f = \langle \mathrm{p}^{(n)}, b_1, \ldots, b_m\rangle : \Gamma.A_1.A_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.A_n\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}\} \longrightarrow B_1.B_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.B_m\{\mathrm{p}^{(m-1)}\},$$

so

$$c_k\{f\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A_1.A_2\{\mathrm{p}\}.\ldots.A_n\{\mathrm{p}^{(n-1)}\}, C_\ell\{\mathrm{p}^{(m)}\}\{f\}).$$

But $C_\ell\{\mathrm{p}^{(m)}\}\{f\} = C_\ell\{\mathrm{p}^{(n)}\}$ which proves $\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle C_1, \ldots, C_p\rangle$. By (66) and the definition of $\leq_\Gamma$ it is easy to see that

$$\langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \wedge_\Gamma \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle, \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle.$$

Suppose that

$$\langle C_1, \ldots, C_p\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle, \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle.$$

But then by the definition of the order

$$\langle C_1, \ldots, C_p\rangle \leq_\Gamma \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle = \langle A_1, \ldots, A_n\rangle \wedge_\Gamma \langle B_1, \ldots, B_m\rangle$$

as required.

The required properties of $\mathrm{Pr}^\wedge_{\mathcal{C}}$ follows directly from (65) and the functoriality of Ty. □

7.2 Interpretation into a category with families and type constructions

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf. Define for $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma) = (\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma), \leq)$$

where $A \leq B \iff_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$ is inhabited. For $\sigma : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$, define

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}(f)(A) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{Ty}(f)(A).$$

Lemma 7.1 *For a cwf $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is a functor $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}} \to$ Preorder.*

Proof. Let Γ be fixed. We show that $\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma)$ is a pre-order. We have $\mathrm{v}_A \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$, so $A \leq A$. Suppose $A \leq B$ and $B \leq C$, so that for some $s \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$ and $t \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, C\{\mathrm{p}(B)\})$. Thus $\langle \mathrm{p}(A), s\rangle : \Gamma.A \to \Gamma.B$, and hence by applying the Ty functor with this map

$$t\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A), s\rangle\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}(B)\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A), s\rangle\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}).$$

Hence $A \leq C$.

Suppose that $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$ and $A \leq B$ in $\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}(\Gamma)$. Then $f.A : \Delta.A\{f\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.A$ and $s \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$, so

$$s\{f.A\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta.A\{f\}, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}\{f.A\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta.A\{f\}, B\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}(A\{f\})\rangle\}),$$

that is $A\{f\} \leq B\{f\}$. Functoriality of $\mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}}$ follows immediately by the functoriality of Ty. □

Theorem 7.2 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a cwf which admits the type constructions $\Sigma, \Pi, +, \mathrm{N}_0$ and N_1 then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a cwf with first-order doctrine.*

Proof. See Appendix B. □

8 Dependently typed first-order logic

Here we introduce a version the dependently typed first-order logic of (Belo 2007) which generalizes the standard presentation of many-sorted first-order logic (Johnstone 2002). The first version DFOL uses capture avoiding substitutions and standardized contexts, and is suitable for an easy completeness proof. The second version DFOL* is closer to (Belo 2007) and is introduced and related to DFOL in Section 8.2.

The predicate symbols are given by a discrete set P. Suppose that Σ is a term signature over a given symbol system (V, T, F) and P is disjoint from $T \cup F$. A *predicate declaration relative to* Σ is a triple $D = (\Gamma, (i_1, \ldots, i_k), R)$ where $\Gamma \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \mathrm{DS}(\Gamma)$ and $R \in P$. The symbol declared is $\mathrm{decl}(D) =_{\mathrm{def}} R$. If $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$, we also write the declaration as

$$R(x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}) \quad (\Gamma).$$

A *predicate signature relative to* Σ is a set Π of predicate declarations relative to Σ satisfying the uniqueness condition $D = D'$ whenever $\mathrm{decl}(D) = \mathrm{decl}(D')$ for $D, D' \in \Pi$. A first order signature is a pair (Σ, Π) consisting of a term signature Σ and a predicate signature Π relative to Σ.

Given this we can form the set of formulas for a signature (Σ, Π). Note that we do not assume equality as a standard predicate. Let $\mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ be the smallest set of judgement expressions

$$\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)$$

formed by the rules:

(F1) For each predicate declaration $(\Delta, \bar{i}, R)$ in Π, and $(\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ we have

$$\frac{}{R(\bar{a}_i) \text{ form } (\Gamma)}$$

(F2) For $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

$$\frac{}{\bot \text{ form } (\Gamma)} \qquad \frac{}{\top \text{ form } (\Gamma)}$$

(F3) For the connectives $\bigcirc = \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$:

$$\frac{\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma) \quad \psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)}{(\phi \bigcirc \psi) \text{ form } (\Gamma)}$$

(F4) For the quantifiers $Q = \forall, \exists$, and for $(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

$$\frac{\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)}{(Qx : A)\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)}$$

The free variables of formulas are defined by induction in the usual way, but where the quantifier case is modified:

$$\mathrm{FV}((Qx : A)\phi) = \mathrm{FV}(A) \cup (\mathrm{FV}(\phi) \setminus \{x\}).$$

Remark 8.1 The free variables of the formula ϕ in context Γ will all be declared in Γ. Observe that by the formation rule for quantifiers, the bound and free variables of the formula ϕ will always be distinct. Also if $((Qx : A)\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, then x cannot be bound in ϕ. Thus for instance

$$(\forall x : A)R(x) \text{ form } (x : A)$$

is not well-formed.

We have the following presupposition result, which follows by induction on formation of formulas.

Lemma 8.2 *If* $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$*, then* $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*.* □

We define inductively the notion of a formula $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ being on *standard form (with respect to* Σ*)* as follows

- for ϕ atomic, $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$ is on standard form, whenever Γ is a context on standard form with respect to Σ,
- if $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$ and $(\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$ are on standard form, then so is $(\phi \bigcirc \psi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$, for $\bigcirc = \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$,
- if $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A))$ is on standard form, then so is $((Qx : A)\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$, for $Q = \forall, \exists$.

The following is evident:

Lemma 8.3 *If* $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$*, and* Σ *has the de Bruijn property, then* $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma))$ *is on standard form with respect to* Σ*.* $\square$

Capture avoiding substitution: We define for $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ and $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ the capture avoiding substitution instance

$$\phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\}$$

by induction on formulas:

- if $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ and ϕ is atomic, then

  $$\phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} = \phi[\bar{a}/\Gamma]$$

  (syntactic substitution).

- if $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ and $(\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, then

  $$(\phi \bigcirc \psi)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} = \phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \bigcirc \psi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\}$$

  for $\bigcirc = \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$.

- if $(\theta \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, then for $Q = \forall, \exists$,

  $$((Qx : A)\theta)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} = (Qy : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\theta\{(\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y))\}\big)$$

  where $y = \text{fresh}(\Delta)$.

Lemma 8.4 *If* $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$ *and* $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$*, then* $(\phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \text{ form } (\Delta)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$*. Note that the height of formulas are preserved under substitution.*

Proof. By induction on formulas. $\square$

For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, we have a judgement expression called *sequent*

$$\phi \Longrightarrow \psi \quad (\Gamma)$$

also written

$$\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi$$

intended to mean that in the context Γ, the formula ψ is true whenever ϕ is true. A *theory* with respect to the signature (Π, Σ) is a set of sequents over the same signature.

Let T be a theory with respect to the signature (Π, Σ). Let $\text{Thm}(\Pi, \Sigma, T)$ denote the smallest set of sequents containing T and closed under the propositional and quantificational rules, and the substitution rules below.

Propositional rules. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\theta \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$

(ref)

$$\frac{}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi.}$$

(cut)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta \quad \theta \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(conj)

$$\frac{}{\theta \wedge \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta} \quad \frac{}{\theta \wedge \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi} \quad \frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta \quad \phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta \wedge \psi} \quad \frac{}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \top}$$

(disj)

$$\frac{}{\theta \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta \vee \psi} \quad \frac{}{\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \theta \vee \psi} \quad \frac{\theta \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi \quad \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\theta \vee \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \quad \frac{}{\bot \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}$$

(impl)

$$\frac{\theta \wedge \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\theta \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi \to \phi} \qquad \frac{\theta \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi \to \phi}{\theta \wedge \psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}$$

Write for the canonical projection

$$\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A) = (\langle \Gamma, x : A \rangle, \Gamma, \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)). \tag{67}$$

Quantificational rules. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$:

(univ)

$$\frac{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi} \qquad \frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi}{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(exis)

$$\frac{\psi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}}{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \qquad \frac{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\psi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}}$$

Substitution rule. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, and $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

(subs)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \overset{\Delta}{\Longrightarrow} \psi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\}.}$$

8.1 Soundness and completeness

In this subsection we assume that the variable system of Σ has the de Bruijn property. We show that the Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra T over (Σ, Π) forms a first-order hyperdoctrine over $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$.

For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{F}_\Sigma$, define

$$\mathrm{Pr}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma) =_{\mathrm{def}} \{(\Gamma, \phi) : (\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)\}.$$

and define its order relation $(\leq_{\mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)}) = (\leq)$ as follows

$$(\Gamma, \phi) \leq (\Gamma, \psi) \text{ iff } (\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T)$$

It is clear that $(\mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma), \leq)$ is a Heyting algebra. For an arrow $(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})$ from Δ to Γ in $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$, define for $(\Gamma, \phi) \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$,

$$\mathrm{Pr}((\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a}))(\Gamma, \phi) = (\Delta, \phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\})$$

By the substitution rule this an order preserving map, and by the definition of capture avoiding substitution it is clear that it preserves $\top, \wedge, \bot, \vee, \rightarrow$. We consider the axioms for quantifiers. For $(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi) \in \mathrm{Pr}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle)$ define

$$\forall_{(\Gamma,A)}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi) =_{\mathrm{def}} (\Gamma, (\forall x : A)\psi)$$

$$\exists_{(\Gamma,A)}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi) =_{\mathrm{def}} (\Gamma, (\exists x : A)\psi).$$

Consider $S = (\Gamma, A)$, $Q = (\Gamma, \phi) \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma)$ and $R = (\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi) \in \mathrm{Pr}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle)$. Then by the quantifier rules,

$$\begin{aligned} Q \leq \forall_S(R) \quad &\text{iff} \quad (\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T) \\ &\text{iff} \quad (\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \exists_S(R) \leq Q \quad &\text{iff} \quad ((\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T) \\ &\text{iff} \quad (\psi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\mathrm{fresh}(\Gamma) = x$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q\{\mathbf{p}(S)\} &= Q\{(\Gamma.\mathrm{S}, \Gamma, \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma))\} \\ &= Q\{(\langle \Gamma, \mathrm{fresh}(\Gamma) : A\rangle, \Gamma, \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma))\} \\ &= Q\{(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \Gamma, \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma))\} \\ &= \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}, \end{aligned}$$

conditions 3(a) and 3(b) are fulfilled.

We check condition 4. Suppose $S = (\Gamma, A)$, and $R = (\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi) \in \mathrm{Pr}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle)$. Let $f = (\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a}) \in \mathrm{Arr}(\mathcal{F}_\Sigma)$. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \forall_S(R)\{f\} & = & ((\forall x : A)\psi)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \\ & = & (\forall y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\psi\{(\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y))\}\big) \end{array}$$

On the other hand, since

$$S\{f\} = (\Gamma, A)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} = (\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])$$

$$\mathrm{p}_\Delta(S\{f\}) = (\Delta.S\{f\}, \Delta, \mathrm{OV}(\Delta)) = (\langle \Delta, \mathrm{fresh}(\Delta) : S\{f\}\rangle, \Delta, \mathrm{OV}(\Delta))$$

and $\mathrm{fresh}(\Delta) = y$, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathsf{v}_{\Delta, S\{f\}} & = & (S\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}_\Delta(S\{f\})\}, \mathrm{fresh}(\Delta)) \\ & = & ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\{(\langle \Delta, y : S\{f\}\rangle, \Delta, \mathrm{OV}(\Delta))\}, y) \\ & = & ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma][\mathrm{OV}(\Delta)/\Delta]), y) \\ & = & ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]), y) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f.S & = & \langle f \circ \mathrm{p}_\Delta(S\{f\}), \mathsf{v}_{S\{f\}}\rangle_{\mathrm{S}} \\ & = & \langle (\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a}) \circ (\langle \Delta, y : S\{f\}\rangle, \Delta, \mathrm{OV}(\Delta)), ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]), y)\rangle \\ & = & \langle (\langle \Delta, y : S\{f\}\rangle, \Gamma, \bar{a} \circ \mathrm{OV}(\Delta)), ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]), y)\rangle \\ & = & \langle (\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \Gamma, \bar{a}), ((\Delta, A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]), y)\rangle \\ & = & (\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y)) \end{array}$$

Hence

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \forall_{S\{f\}}(R\{f.S\}) & = & \forall_{S\{f\}}((\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi)\{f.S\}) \\ & = & (\forall y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\psi\{(\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y))\}\big). \end{array}$$

Thus $\forall_S(R)\{f\} = \forall_{S\{f\}}(R\{f.S\})$ as required. The verification of

$$\exists_S(R)\{f\} = \exists_{S\{f\}}(R\{f.S\})$$

is the same as above, just replacing $\forall$ with $\exists$.

We conclude that

Theorem 8.1 *(Completeness: Universal model) The Lindenbaum-Tarski algebra for a theory T over (Σ, Π),*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} =_{\mathrm{def}} (\mathcal{F}_\Sigma, \mathrm{Pr}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T}, \forall, \exists)$$

is a hyperdoctrine over $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$. It has the universal model property, i.e. that

$$(\Gamma, \phi) \leq (\Gamma, \psi) \text{ if, and only if, } (\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T).$$

□

Let T be a dependent first-order theory over (Σ, Π). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the hyperdoctrine $\mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} = (\mathcal{F}_\Sigma, \mathrm{Pr}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T}, \forall, \exists)$. A *dependent first-order model of* T consists of a Σ-structure given by a cwf morphism $F : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and a hyperdoctrine $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}, \forall', \exists')$ with an F-based hyperdoctrine morphism $G : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$. This means that G is a natural transformation $G : \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}} \circ F$ such that for $R \in \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}}(\Gamma.S)$,

1. $G_\Gamma(\forall_S(R)) = \forall'_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G_{\Gamma.S}(R))$,
2. $G_\Gamma(\exists_S(R)) = \exists'_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G_{\Gamma.S}(R))$.

That G is natural

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}}(\Gamma) & \xrightarrow{G_\Gamma} & \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}(F\Gamma) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}}(f)} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}(Ff)} \\ \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}}(\Delta) & \xrightarrow[G_\Delta]{} & \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}(F\Delta) \end{array} \tag{68}$$

amounts to the following condition on substitution: for $f = (\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})$,

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})\}) = \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}(F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t}))(G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi)) = G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi)\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})\}.$$

Example 8.5 Let T and T' be dependent first-order theories over (Σ, Π), with $T \subseteq T'$. Then there is a hyperdoctrine morphism $G : \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T'}$ given by letting F be the identity cwf morphism on $\mathcal{F}_\Sigma$, and defining $G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi) = (\Gamma, \phi)$. It is order preserving, since

$$(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T) \text{ implies } (\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T').$$

Theorem 8.2 *Let T be a dependent first-order theory over (Σ, Π), where the signatures are on standard form. Let G and G' be two F-based hyperdoctrine morphisms $\mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$. If for every $(\Gamma, R) \in \Pi$,*

$$G_\Gamma(\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma})) = G'_\Gamma(\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma}))$$

holds in $\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{D}}(F(\Gamma))$, then $G = G'$.

Proof. Write $\mathrm{Pr} = \mathrm{Pr}^{\mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T}}$. It suffices to show that for each $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_\Sigma$ and each $P \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Delta)$,

$$G_\Delta(P) = G'_\Delta(P).$$

We prove this by induction on derivations in $\mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$. Let $(\Gamma, R) \in \Pi$ and $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Then by naturality of G and G' and the assumption

$$\begin{aligned} G_\Delta(\Delta, R(\bar{a})) &= G_\Delta((\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma})\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\}) \\ &= G_\Gamma(\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma})\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \\ &= G'_\Gamma(\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma})\{F(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} \\ &= G'_\Delta((\Gamma, R(\check{\Gamma})\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\}) \\ &= G'_\Delta(\Delta, R(\bar{a})) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover since G_Δ and G'_Δ are Heyting algebra morphisms, the cases for propostional operations are immediate induction steps. Suppose $R \in \mathrm{Pr}(\Gamma.S)$. Then using the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} G_\Gamma(\forall_S(R)) &= \forall_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G_{\Gamma.S}(R)) \\ &= \forall_{\sigma_\Gamma(S)}(G'_{\Gamma.S}(R)) \\ &= G'_\Gamma(\forall_S(R)). \end{aligned}$$

The case for $\exists$ is proved similarly. $\Box$

Theorem 8.3 *Let Σ be a signature on standard form and $F : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ a cwf morphism. Suppose that Π is a predicate signature on standard form over Σ. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a hyperdoctrine based on $\mathcal{C}$, and suppose that for each $R = (\Gamma_R, P_R) \in \Pi$, there is $R^* \in \mathrm{Pr}_\mathcal{C}(\Gamma_R)$. Then there is a unique F-based hyperdoctrine morphism $G : \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,\emptyset} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ with*

$$G_{\Gamma_R}(P_R(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_R))) = R^*$$

for each $R \in \Pi$.

Proof. The uniqueness follows by Theorem 8.2. Suppose $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}^\mathcal{D}, \forall', \exists')$ and write $F = (F, \sigma, \theta)$. Define G by induction on the height of derivations in $\mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$. We define for each $R \in \Pi$ and $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma_R) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ define

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, R(\bar{a})) = R^*\{F(\Delta, \Gamma_R, \bar{a})\}$$

Furthermore let

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, \top) = \top' \qquad G_\Delta(\Delta, \bot) = \bot'.$$

For the propositional operations $\bigcirc = \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$,

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi \bigcirc \psi) = G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi) \bigcirc' G_\Delta(\Delta, \psi).$$

For the quantifiers $Q = \forall, \exists$,

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, (Qx : A)\phi) = Q'_{\sigma_\Delta(A)}(G_{\Delta,x:A}(\langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, \phi)).$$

Next, we need show that G is a natural transformation, i.e.

$$G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} = G_\Theta(\Theta, \phi\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\})$$

for all $(\bar{t} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Delta) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. This is done by induction on the formula ϕ:

As for the atomic predicate case:

$$\begin{aligned} G_\Delta(\Delta, R(\bar{a}))\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} &= R^*\{F(\Delta, \Gamma_R, \bar{a})\}\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &= R^*\{F(\Theta, \Gamma_R, \bar{a} \circ \bar{t})\} \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, R(\bar{a}[\bar{t}/\Delta])) \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, R(\bar{a})\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}). \end{aligned}$$

As for the constants $K = \bot, \top$:

$$\begin{aligned} G_\Delta(\Delta, K)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} &= K'\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &= K' \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, K) \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, K\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \end{aligned}$$

As for the connectives $\bigcirc = \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$,

$$\begin{aligned} G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi \bigcirc \psi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} &= (G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi) \bigcirc' G_\Delta(\Delta, \psi))\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &= (G_\Delta(\Delta, \phi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \bigcirc' (G_\Delta(\Delta, \psi))\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, \phi\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \bigcirc' G_\Theta(\Theta, \psi\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, \phi\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \bigcirc \psi\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \\ &= G_\Theta(\Theta, (\phi \bigcirc \psi)\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}). \end{aligned}$$

As for the quantifiers $Q = \forall, \exists$, we have the following equations, where step 1 is by definition of G, step 2 by the Beck-Chevalley conditions and step 3 is by naturality of σ,

$$\begin{aligned} &G_\Delta(\Delta, (Qx : A)\phi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &\quad = Q'_{\sigma_\Delta(A)}(G_{\Delta, x:A}(\langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, \phi))\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\} \\ &\quad = Q'_{\sigma_\Delta(A)\{F(\Theta,\Delta,\bar{t})\}}(G_{\Delta, x:A}(\langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, \phi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t}).\sigma_\Delta(A)\}) \\ &\quad = Q'_{\sigma_\Theta(A[\bar{t}/\Delta])}(G_{\Delta, x:A}(\langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, \phi)\{F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t}).\sigma_\Delta(A)\}) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have the equations below, where step 1 is by definition of substitution, step 2 by the definition of G and step 3 the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} &G_\Delta(\Delta, ((Qx : A)\phi)\{(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t})\}) \\ &\quad = G_\Theta(\Theta, (Qy : A[\bar{t}/\Delta])\phi\{(\langle \Theta, y : A[\bar{t}/\Delta]\rangle, \langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, (\bar{t}, y))\}) \\ &\quad = Q'_{\sigma_\Theta(A[\bar{t}/\Delta])}(G_{\Theta, y:A[\bar{t}/\Delta]}(\langle \Theta, y : A[\bar{t}/\Delta]\rangle, \phi\{(\langle \Theta, y : A[\bar{t}/\Delta]\rangle, \langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, (\bar{t}, y))\})) \\ &\quad = Q'_{\sigma_\Theta(A[\bar{t}/\Delta])}(G_{\Delta, x:A}(\langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, \phi)\{F(\langle \Theta, y : A[\bar{t}/\Delta]\rangle, \langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, (\bar{t}, y))\}) \end{aligned}$$

where $y = \text{fresh}(\Theta)$. Now it only remains to prove:

$$F(\Theta, \Delta, \bar{t}).\sigma_\Delta(A) = F(\langle \Theta, y : A[\bar{t}/\Delta]\rangle, \langle \Delta, x : A\rangle, (\bar{t}, y))$$

But this follows from Lemma 5.1. □

Theorem 8.4 *(Soundness) Let Σ be a signature on standard form and $F : \mathcal{F}_\Sigma \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}$ a cwf morphism. Suppose that Π is a predicate signature on standard form over Σ. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a hyperdoctrine based on $\mathcal{C}$. Suppose that $G : \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,\emptyset} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an F-based*

hyperdoctrine morphism. Let T be a theory over Σ, Π and assume that for every sequent $(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in T$,

$$G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi) \leq G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \psi).$$

Then $G : \mathcal{H}_{\Sigma,\Pi,T} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is also model of T.

Proof. We prove by induction on proofs that

$$(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T) \text{ implies } G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi) \leq G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \psi). \tag{69}$$

The basic case is the assumption. The (ref) rule is trivial, and (cut) rule follows from the inductive hypotheses, The propositional rules follows from the inductive hypothesis noting that G_Γ preserves the propositional operations.

Quantifier rules.

(univ, left): Suppose the last rule applied is

$$\frac{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi}$$

By inductive hypothesis

$$G_{\Gamma,x:A}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}) \leq G_{\Gamma,x:A}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi).$$

By naturality of G and since F preserves projections (25):

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\Gamma,x:A}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\}) &= (G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi))\{F(\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A))\} \\ &= (G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi))\{\mathrm{p}_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(x : A))\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$(G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi))\{\mathrm{p}_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(x : A))\} \leq G_{\Gamma,x:A}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi).$$

By property 3(a) of the hyperdoctrine, and using that G is morphism of hyperdoctrines (property 1):

$$G_\Gamma(\Gamma, \phi) \leq \forall_{\sigma_\Gamma(x:A)}(G_{\Gamma,x:A}(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, \psi)) = G_\Gamma(\Gamma, (\forall x : A)\psi)$$

(univ,right): similar.

(exis, left): analogous using property 2 of G.

(exis, right): analogous using property 2 of G.

(univ)

$$\frac{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi} \qquad \frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi}{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A)\} \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(exis)

$$\frac{\psi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\}}{(\exists x:A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \qquad \frac{(\exists x:A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\psi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\}}$$

Subsititution rule: Suppose the last rule used is (subs). I.e. for $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

(subs)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi\{(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a})\} \overset{\Delta}{\Longrightarrow} \psi\{(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a})\}.}$$

By inductive hypothesis we have

$$G_\Gamma(\Gamma,\phi) \leq G_\Gamma(\Gamma,\psi).$$

Thus applying the substitution $F(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a}))$,

$$(G_\Gamma(\Gamma,\phi))\{F(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a}))\} \leq (G_\Gamma(\Gamma,\psi))\{F(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a}))\}$$

The naturality of G gives

$$G_\Delta(\Delta,\phi\{(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a})\}) \leq G_\Delta(\Delta,\psi\{(\Delta,\Gamma,\bar{a})\})$$

as required. □

8.2 A variant with syntactic substitution

We briefly consider a version of DFOL with ordinary syntactic substitution and unrestricted variable systems Σ. This version will be called DFOL* and is close to the system of (Belo 2007). In that paper, raw formulas are defined from the symbols from our signatures (Σ,Π). The notion of simultaneous syntactic substitution $\phi[\bar{t}/\bar{x}]$ into formulas is defined. To make this operation totally defined we use α-equivalence between formulas. Taking equivalence classes of formulas, allows substitution to be defined on representatives where no illegitmate binding of free variables in $\bar{t}$ by bound variables of ϕ at the location of substitution takes occur; see (Prop. 3 and 4, Belo 2007). We can now reconsider the inductive definition of $\mathrm{Form}(\Sigma,\Pi)$ in (F1) – (F4) as taking the corresponding α-equivalence classes of formulas instead of only formulas. We called resulting set $\mathrm{Form}^*(\Sigma,\Pi)$. (Note that the previous example $(\forall x:A)R(x)$ form $(x:A)$ is actually in this set, since it is α-equivalent to $(\forall y:A)R(y)$ form $(x:A)$.)

The rules (ref), (cut) and rules for the propositional connectives are the same as for DFOL. The substitution rule is now

Syntactic substitution rule. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}^*(\Sigma,\Pi)$, and any $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$

(sub*)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi[\bar{a}/\Gamma] \overset{\Delta}{\Longrightarrow} \psi[\bar{a}/\Gamma].}$$

The quantifier rules can now be simplified to align with those of (Johnstone 2002).

Quantificational rules. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \mathrm{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$:

(univ*)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi} \qquad \frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(exis*)

$$\frac{\psi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \qquad \frac{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\psi \overset{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}$$

For a theory T over (Σ, Π) let $\mathrm{Thm}^*(\Sigma, \Pi, T)$ denote the smallest set of sequence derivable from T using the above mentioned rules.

Lemma 8.6 *Let (Σ, Π) be a signature with the de Bruijn property. For every $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$, and $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ on standard form,*

$$(\phi\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})\} \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \equiv_\alpha (\phi[\bar{t}/\Gamma] \text{ form } (\Gamma))$$

in $\mathrm{Form}(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi)$.

Proof. The atomic base case is clear, as well as the inductive cases for propositional connectives. Suppose $\phi = (Qx : A)\theta$, ($Q = \forall$ or $\exists$) where $(\theta \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma, \Pi)$. Then

$$((Qx : A)\theta)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{a})\} = (Qy : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\theta\{(\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y))\}\big)$$

where $y = \mathrm{fresh}(\Delta)$. Now by inductive hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned} &(Qy : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\theta\{(\langle \Delta, y : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{a}, y))\}\big) \\ &\quad \equiv_\alpha \quad (Qy : A[\bar{a}/\Gamma])\big(\theta[\bar{a}, y/\Gamma, x : A]\big) \\ &\quad \equiv_\alpha \quad ((Qx : A)\theta)[\bar{a}/\Gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

which establishes the result. □

Theorem 8.5 *Let (Σ, Π) be a signature with the de Bruijn property, and let T be a theory on standard form over (Σ, Π). If $(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T)$, then $(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}^*(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi, T)$.*

Proof. Induction on derivations. The base cases are the axioms: the logical axioms (ref), axioms for $\top$ and $\bot$, and the non-logical axioms of T. These are clear. The inductive cases for propositional connectives follows by the inductive hypotheses, as well as for the (cut) rule. Consider the quantifier rules

(univ)

$$\frac{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\} \stackrel{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \stackrel{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x:A)\psi} \qquad \frac{\phi \stackrel{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x:A)\psi}{\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\} \stackrel{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(exis)

$$\frac{\psi \stackrel{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\}}{(\exists x:A)\psi \stackrel{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \qquad \frac{(\exists x:A)\psi \stackrel{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\psi \stackrel{\Gamma,x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\}}$$

Since by Lemma 8.6

$$(\phi\{\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x:A)\} \text{ form } (\Gamma, x:A)) \equiv_\alpha (\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x:A))$$

we can use the corresponding rules (univ*) and (exis*) and the inductive hypothesis to prove quantifier cases. Similar using this lemma we can apply (subs*) in the case of the (sub) rule. □

Let $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ be a fresh variable sequence for Σ. For every formula $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$ we introduce a standardized formula $(\phi^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$ by induction on formulas:

- If $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$ is atomic, then $(\phi[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$, so let
$$\phi^\sigma = \phi[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma].$$
- Suppose that $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$. Then we have $(\phi^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma))$, $(\psi^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$. Let
$$(\phi \bigcirc \psi)^\sigma = \phi^\sigma \bigcirc \psi^\sigma.$$
Hence $((\phi \bigcirc \psi)^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$.
- Suppose that $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x:A)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$. By inductive hypothesis,
$$(\phi^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi).$$
Thus
$$\big(Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\phi^\sigma \text{ form } (\sigma(\Gamma))) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi).$$
Let
$$((Qx:A)\phi)^\sigma = \big(Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\phi^\sigma.$$

Lemma 8.7 *Suppose that* $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$*, and that* $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ *is a fresh variable sequence for* Σ*. Then:*

$$\phi[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma) \equiv_\alpha \phi^\sigma \text{ form } (\Gamma^\sigma)$$

Proof. By induction on formulas. For the atomic case, and the propositional connectives case this is straightforward. Consider the quantifier case: Let $\phi = (Qx : A)\theta$, where $(\theta \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \text{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$. We have using the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}((Qx : A)\theta)^\sigma &= \big(Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\theta^\sigma \\ &\equiv_\alpha \big(Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\theta[\sigma(\Gamma, x : A)/\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle] \\ &= \big(Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\theta[(\sigma(\Gamma), \sigma(|\Gamma|))/\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle] \\ &\equiv_\alpha ((Qx : A)\theta)[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the induction. □

If T is a theory with respect to (Σ, Π), then let

$$T^\sigma = \{(\phi^\sigma \Longrightarrow \psi^\sigma\ (\Gamma^\sigma)) : (\phi \Longrightarrow \psi\ (\Gamma)) \in T\},$$

which is a theory with respect to the same signature.

For every signature Σ, there is a canonical fresh variable sequence given by $\sigma_\Sigma = \sigma$,

$$\sigma(n) = \text{fr}_\Sigma(\{\sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n-1)\}).$$

Then for a context $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$, the map $\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma$ is given by

$$\sigma(\Gamma) = (\sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n-1)),$$

and its inverse is just

$$\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) = (x_1, \ldots, x_n).$$

Lemma 8.8 *Let Σ be a signature with the de Bruijn property. If $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$ is a judgement where the context involved is on standard form with respect to Σ, then $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.*

Proof. By induction on derivations. The case (R1) is direct.

As for case (R2): Suppose $(\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$ and that $\Gamma, x : A$ is on standard form. Then $x = \text{fresh}(\Gamma)$, and by inductive hypothesis $(\Gamma\text{context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and $(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Hence by (R2), $(\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

Case (R3): by inductive hypothesis.

Case (R4): Suppose that $(S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) \text{ type } (\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$ is derived by (R4), where $(\Gamma, S, \bar{i}) \in \Sigma^{(\infty)}$, and by shorter derivations $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$. Suppose moreover that Δ is on standard form. Now since $\Sigma^{(\infty)}$ and Σ have the same declarations, $(\Gamma, S, \bar{i}) \in \Sigma$. Thus Γ is on standard form, and since Δ is on standard form, the judgements in $\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ have contexts on standard form. It follows by inductive hypothesis, $(\bar{a} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Hence by (R4), $(S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) \text{ type } (\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

Case (R5): similar to (R4). □

Lemma 8.9 *Let Σ be a signature with the de Bruijn property, and let $\sigma = \sigma_\Sigma$. If $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$, then*

$$(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta) : \Delta^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma).$$

If $|\Gamma| = m$ and $|\Delta| = n$,

$$\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta) = (t_1[\bar{\sigma}(n)/\Delta], \ldots, t_m[\bar{\sigma}(n)/\Delta]),$$

where $\bar{\sigma}(n) = \sigma(0), \ldots, \sigma(n-1)$.

Proof. We have by composition

$$(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta) : \Delta^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)}).$$

But all the judgements in this compound judgement have contexts on standard form with respect to Σ, so by Lemma 8.8,

$$(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta) : \Delta^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma).$$

□

Write

$$(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma =_{\text{def}} (\Delta^\sigma, \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta)).$$

Consider the canonical projection

$$\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A) = (\langle \Gamma, x : A \rangle, \Gamma, \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)).$$

Thus

$$(\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A))^\sigma = (\langle \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \rangle, \Gamma^\sigma, \bar{\sigma}(\Gamma)) = \mathbf{p}_{\Gamma^\sigma}(\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]). \quad (70)$$

Lemma 8.10 *Let (Σ, Π) be a signature with the de Bruijn property. Suppose that $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi)$ and that $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$. Then for $\sigma = \sigma_\Sigma$:*

$$(\phi^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} = (\phi^\sigma)\{(\Delta^\sigma, \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta))\} = (\phi[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma.$$

Proof. By induction on the formula ϕ.

Case $\phi = P$ atomic:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(P^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&= (P[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&= (P[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])[\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta)/\sigma(\Gamma)] \\
&= (P[\bar{t}/\Gamma])[\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta] \\
&= (P[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\phi = \psi \bigcirc \theta$: Using the inductive hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&((\psi \bigcirc \theta)^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&\quad = \quad (\psi^\sigma \bigcirc \theta^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&\quad = \quad (\psi^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \bigcirc (\theta^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&\quad = \quad (\psi[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma \bigcirc (\theta[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma \\
&\quad = \quad (\psi[\bar{t}/\Gamma] \bigcirc \theta[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma \\
&\quad = \quad ((\psi \bigcirc \theta)[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\phi = (Qx : A)\psi$: We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(((Qx : A)\psi)^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&\quad = \quad ((Q\,\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])\psi^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} \\
&\quad = \quad (Q\,y : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma][\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta)/\sigma(\Gamma)]) \\
&\qquad\qquad \psi^\sigma\{(\langle\Delta^\sigma, y : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma][\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta)/\sigma(\Gamma)]\rangle, \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \langle\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle, (\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta), y))\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $y = \text{fresh}(\Delta^\sigma)$. The right hand side is

$$\begin{aligned}
&(Q\,y : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma][\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta]) \\
&\quad \psi^\sigma\{(\langle\Delta^\sigma, y : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma][\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta]\rangle, \\
&\qquad \langle\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle, (\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta), y))\}
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

Now consider the context map, where $z \in \text{Fresh}(\Delta)$,

$$f =_{\text{def}} (\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle, \langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle, (\bar{t}, z)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)}).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
f^\sigma \quad = \quad &(\langle\Delta^\sigma, \sigma(|\Delta|) : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma][\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta]\rangle, \langle\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle, \\
&\qquad \sigma^{-1}(\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle) \circ (\bar{t}, z) \circ \sigma(\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle))
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 8.9 with $|\Gamma| = m$ and $|\Delta| = n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^{-1}(\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle) \\
&\quad = \quad (t_1[\bar{\sigma}(n+1)/\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle], \ldots, t_m[\bar{\sigma}(n+1)/\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle, z[\bar{\sigma}(n+1)/\langle\Delta, z : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma]\rangle]) \\
&\quad = \quad (t_1[\bar{\sigma}(n)/\Delta], \ldots, t_m[\bar{\sigma}(n)/\Delta]\rangle, \sigma(n)) \\
&\quad = \quad (\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta), y).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that $\sigma(n) = \sigma(|\Delta|) = \text{fresh}(\Delta^\sigma) = y$. Thus

$$f^\sigma = (\langle\Delta^\sigma, y : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma][\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta]\rangle, \langle\Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle, (\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta), y)),$$

which occurs in (71).

The inductive hypothesis gives

$$\psi^\sigma\{f^\sigma\} = (\psi[\bar{t}, z/\Gamma, x : A])^\sigma$$

Combining the above equalities we get

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
(((Qx : A)\psi)^\sigma)\{(\Delta, \Gamma, \bar{t})^\sigma\} & & \\
& = & \big(Q\, y : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma][\sigma(\Delta)/\Delta]\big)(\psi^\sigma\{f^\sigma\}) \\
& = & (((Qz : A[\bar{t}/\Gamma])\psi[\bar{t}, z/\langle\Gamma, x : A\rangle])^\sigma \\
& = & (((Qx : A)\psi)[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma
\end{array}$$

□

Corollary 8.6 *Let (Σ, Π) be a signature with the de Bruijn property. Suppose that $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)) \in \mathrm{Form}(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi)$. Then for $\sigma = \sigma_\Sigma$:*

$$(\phi^\sigma)\{(\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A))^\sigma\} = \phi^\sigma.$$

Proof. By the theorem

$$(\phi^\sigma)\{(\mathbf{p}_\Gamma(x : A))^\sigma\} = (\phi[\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)/\Gamma])^\sigma = \phi^\sigma.$$

□

Theorem 8.7 *Let (Σ, Π) be a signature with the de Bruijn property, and let T be a theory over (Σ, Π). If $(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}^*(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi, T)$, then $(\phi^\sigma \overset{\Gamma^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T^\sigma)$, where $\sigma = \sigma_\Sigma$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{Thm} = \mathrm{Thm}(\Sigma, \Pi, T^\sigma)$ and $\mathrm{Thm}^* = \mathrm{Thm}^*(\Sigma^{(\infty)}, \Pi, T)$. The proof goes by induction on derivations in Thm^*. The cases for the axioms are clear and so are the cases for propositional connectives and the cut rule. Consider the quantificational rules. For $(\phi \text{ form } (\Gamma)), (\psi \text{ form } (\Gamma, x : A)) \in \mathrm{Form}^*(\Sigma, \Pi)$:

(univ*)

$$\frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi} \qquad \frac{\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi}{\phi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi}$$

(exis*)

$$\frac{\psi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi} \qquad \frac{(\exists x : A)\psi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}{\psi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \phi}$$

Case (univ*, left): Suppose that $(\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\forall x : A)\psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}^*$ has been derived by (univ,left). Then $(\phi \overset{\Gamma, x:A}{\Longrightarrow} \psi) \in \mathrm{Thm}^*$ by a shorter derivation, and by inductive hypothesis $(\phi^\sigma \overset{(\Gamma, x:A)^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm}$. But

$$(\Gamma, x : A)^\sigma = \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma].$$

We need to show

$$(\phi^\sigma \stackrel{\Gamma^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} ((\forall x : A)\psi)^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm}.$$

Now

$$((\forall x : A)\psi)^\sigma = \big(\forall\, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\big)\phi^\sigma,$$

so we need only show

$$(\phi^\sigma\{\mathbf{p}_{\Gamma^\sigma}(\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])\} \stackrel{\Gamma^\sigma,\sigma(|\Gamma|):A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]}{\Longrightarrow} \psi^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm}.$$

If we can show

$$\phi^\sigma\{\mathbf{p}_{\Gamma^\sigma}(\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma])\} = \phi^\sigma \tag{72}$$

we are done. But this follows from (70) and Corollary 8.6.

Case (univ*, right): using (72) as above this follows by inductive hypothesis and (univ, right).

Case (exis*, left): using (72) as above this follows by inductive hypothesis and (exis, left).

Case (exis*, right): using (72) as above this follows by inductive hypothesis and (exis, right).

Case (subs*): Suppose that $(\phi[\bar{t}/\Gamma] \stackrel{\Delta}{\Longrightarrow} \psi[\bar{t}/\Gamma]) \in \mathrm{Thm}^*$ has been derived by the substitution rule from $(\phi \stackrel{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi)$ and $(\bar{t} : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma^{(\infty)})$. By the inductive hypothesis

$$(\phi^\sigma \stackrel{\Gamma^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} \psi^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm}.$$

Thus

$$(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \bar{t} \circ \sigma(\Delta) : \Delta^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

and hence by (subs)

$$((\phi^\sigma)\{(\Delta^\sigma, \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta))\} \stackrel{\Delta^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} (\psi^\sigma)\{(\Delta^\sigma, \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma)\bar{t}\sigma(\Delta))\}) \in \mathrm{Thm}.$$

Then by Lemma 8.10 we have

$$((\phi[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma \stackrel{\Delta^\sigma}{\Longrightarrow} (\psi[\bar{t}/\Gamma])^\sigma) \in \mathrm{Thm},$$

as required. □

9 Some uses of dependently typed first-order logic

We indicate two uses of DFOL for dealing with some well-known shortcomings of intuitionistic first-order logic.

9.1 Local propositions as types

A feature of the dependently typed logic is that it has a *local propositions-as-types* principle. This means the possibility to extend the signature with a type for the proof objects of a particular formula. This is useful in the definition of functions whose domains are restricted by a formula.

Consider a fixed signature. Suppose $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ is a context and that ϕ is a formula in that context. Add a new dependent type to the signature

$$F(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \text{ type} \quad (\Gamma)$$

Then add two axioms over the extended signature

$$\top \Longrightarrow \phi \quad (\Gamma, p : F(x_1, \ldots, x_n))$$

$$\phi \overset{\Gamma}{\Longrightarrow} (\exists p : F(x_1, \ldots, x_n))\top.$$

The truth of $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ has thus been encoded as inhabitedness of $F(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. We call F a *proposition-type* for ϕ.

9.2 Treatment of partial functions

In classical (non-dependent, many-sorted) logic a partial functional relation, can be extended to a function. Suppose

$$x =_A u, y =_B z, \phi(x, y) \Longrightarrow \phi(u, z) \tag{73}$$

and

$$\phi(x, y), \phi(x, z) \Longrightarrow y =_B z \tag{74}$$

Assume that b is some constant in B. We can introduce a total function symbol $f : A \to B$ with defining axiom

$$f(x) =_B y \leftrightarrow \phi(x, y) \vee y =_B b \wedge \neg(\exists y : B)\, \phi(x, y).$$

In intuitionistic logic this is not possible, unless the domain of definition of the relation ϕ is decidable. However in dependently typed intuitionistic logic we can do this with the help of dependent types. Suppose again (73) and (74) holds. Introduce a proposition-type D for the domain of definition of ϕ

$$D(x) \text{ type} \quad (x : A)$$

and an axiom

$$\phi(x, y) \Longrightarrow (\exists p : D(x))\top \quad (x : A, y : B)$$

and a dependent function symbol f

$$f(x, p) : B \quad (x : A, p : D(x))$$

with axiom

$$\phi(x, f(x, p)) \quad (x : A, p : D(x))$$

This works constructively as desired, as we can interpret $D(x)$ in type theory as $(\Sigma y : B)\phi(x, y)$ and $f(x, p)$ as $\pi_1(p)$, the first projection of p.

10 Constructive elementary theory of the category of sets

Lawvere's Elementary Theory of the Category of Sets ETCS (Lawvere 1963) is a first-order theory that axiomatizes the category of sets. In (Palmgren 2012) a constructive version of this theory was proposed. The theory, CETCS, used equality of objects, which is not entirely natural for straightforward interpretation as setoids in Martin-Löf type theory. Here we provide a version which avoids equality of objects.

The signature Σ_{Cat} for a category is given by the sequence of declarations below

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{Ob}\ \text{type} & () \\ X \to Y\ \text{type} & (X : \mathsf{Ob}, Y : \mathsf{Ob}) \\ 1(X) : X \to X & (X : \mathsf{Ob}) \\ \circ(g, f) : X \to Z & (X : \mathsf{Ob}, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, Z : \mathsf{Ob}, g : Y \to Z, f : X \to Y) \end{array} \tag{75}$$

As there is no standard equality on each sort, we have to axiomatize the equality relations explicitly. For categories we impose, following Makkai, equality on the arrows, but not on the objects.

$$f = g \text{ form } (X, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, f, g : X \to Y).$$

Axioms stating that it is an equivalence relation are added

$$\begin{array}{ll} f = f & (X, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Y) \\ f = g \Longrightarrow g = f & (X, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, f, g : X \to Y) \\ f = g, g = h \Longrightarrow f = h & (X, Y, Z : \mathsf{Ob}, f, g, h : X \to Y) \end{array} \tag{76}$$

and that composition respects the equality, where we write $\circ(g, f)$ as $g \circ f$,

$$f = h, g = k \Longrightarrow g \circ f = k \circ h \quad (X, Y, Z : \mathsf{Ob}, f, h : X \to Y, g, k : Y \to Z) \tag{77}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} 1(Y) \circ f = f & (X, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Y) \\ f \circ 1(X) = f & (X, Y : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Y) \\ h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f & (X, Y, Z, W : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Y, g : Y \to Z, h : Z \to W) \end{array} \tag{78}$$

The signature for a CETCS category is a follows. In addition to Σ_{Cat} we add declarations for terminal object and pullbacks

1. $1 : \mathsf{Ob} \quad ()$
2. $\mathsf{P}(f, g) : \mathsf{Ob} \quad (X, Y, Z : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Z, g : Y \to Z)$
3. $\mathsf{p}_1(f, g) : \mathsf{P}(f, g) \to X \quad (-"-)$
4. $\mathsf{p}_2(f, g) : \mathsf{P}(f, g) \to Y \quad (-"-)$

and similarly for initial object and pushouts. Further we can add the Π-construction

5. $\Pi(f,g) : \mathsf{Ob} \quad (X,Y,Z : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Y, g : Z \to X)$

6. $\pi(f,g) : \Pi(f,g) \to Y \quad (-"-)$

7. $\mathrm{ev}(f,g) : \mathsf{P}(f, \pi(f,g)) \to Z \quad (-"-)$

Moreover constants for the presentation axiom

8. $\mathrm{Pre}(X) : \mathsf{Ob} \quad (X : \mathsf{Ob})$

9. $\mathsf{pre}(X) : \mathrm{Pre}(X) \to X \quad (X : \mathsf{Ob})$

The theory CETCS of (Palmgren 2012) was presented in ordinary many-sorted intuitionistic logic with equality on all sorts. We here explain how to reformulate the theory using dependent sorts, and thereby avoiding equality on objects. Below only a few crucial and illustrative axioms are considered. The remaining axioms follow the same pattern.

That the object 1 is terminal is formalized as

$$\begin{gathered} f = g \quad (X : \mathsf{Ob}, f, g : X \to 1) \\ (\exists f : X \to 1)\top \quad (X : \mathsf{Ob}) \end{gathered} \tag{79}$$

(We could as well expanded the signature with an explicit function for selecting a map to the terminal $!_x : X \to 1$.) That pullbacks exists are given by

$$f \circ \mathsf{p}_1(f,g) = g \circ \mathsf{p}_2(f,g) \qquad (X,Y,Z : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Z, g : Y \to Z)$$

$$\begin{gathered} f \circ h = g \circ k \Longrightarrow (\exists t : W \to \mathsf{P}(f,g))\, \mathsf{p}_1(f,g) \circ t = h \wedge \mathsf{p}_2(f,g) \circ t = k \\ (X,Y,Z,W : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Z, g : Y \to Z, h : W \to X, k : W \to Y) \end{gathered} \tag{80}$$

$$\begin{gathered} \mathsf{p}_1(f,g) \circ t = \mathsf{p}_1(f,g) \circ s \wedge \mathsf{p}_2(f,g) \circ t = \mathsf{p}_2(f,g) \circ s \Longrightarrow t = s \\ (X,Y,Z,W : \mathsf{Ob}, f : X \to Z, g : Y \to Z, t, s : W \to \mathsf{P}(f,g)) \end{gathered}$$

We have similar axioms for other limits and colimits.

Recall that a morphism $x : 1 \longrightarrow X$ is called an *element* of X. We write this as $x \in X$. A morphism $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is called *surjective* if for every $y \in Y$, there is $x \in X$ such that $f \circ x = y$. The following axiom states that 1 is a strong generator of the category:

(G) Every surjective mono $X \longrightarrow Y$ is an isomorphism.

This can straightforwardly be written as first-order formula.

We consider as in (Palmgren 2012) a sequence of maps $\alpha_1 : P \longrightarrow X_1, \ldots, \alpha_1 : P \longrightarrow X_n$ that are jointly monic as a relation between $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and for elements $x_1 \in X_1, \ldots, x_n \in X_n$ we write

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n)\, \epsilon\, (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$$

if there is $p \in P$ with $\alpha_1 \circ p = x_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \circ p = x_n$. A relation $\alpha_1 : P \longrightarrow X_1, \alpha_2 : P \longrightarrow X_2$ is called a *partial function from* X_1 *to* X_2 if α_1 is mono.

Existence of dependent products is formulated as follows in (Palmgren 2012), which with the introduced constants become: For any mappings $Y \xrightarrow{g} X \xrightarrow{f} I$ we have a commutative diagram



(81)

where for any for any element $i \in I$ and any partial function $\psi =_{\text{def}} (\xi : R \longrightarrow X, \upsilon : R \longrightarrow Y)$ such that

(a) for all $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, $(x, y) \,\epsilon\, \psi$ implies $g \circ y = x$ and $f \circ x = i$,

(b) if $f \circ x = i$, then there is $y \in Y$ with $(x, y) \,\epsilon\, \psi$,

then there is a unique $s \in \Pi(f, g)$ so that $\pi(f, g) \circ s = i$ and for all $x \in X$, $y \in Y$,

$$(s, x, y) \,\epsilon\, \alpha \text{ iff } (x, y) \,\epsilon\, \psi. \tag{82}$$

Here $\alpha =_{\text{def}} (\mathsf{p}_1 : \mathsf{P} \longrightarrow \Pi(f, g), \mathsf{p}_2 : \mathsf{P} \longrightarrow X, \text{ev}(f, g) : \mathsf{P} \longrightarrow Y)$, where $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{P}(f, \pi(f, g))$.

11 Equality on dependent types

If we wish to introduce equality on dependent types there is the established method of using setoids (type with equivalence relations) and proof-irrelevant families of setoids, see for instance (Palmgren 2012b).

Suppose that A is a type with an equivalence relation $=_A$. For a dependent type B over A we may introduce an equivalence relation $=_{B,x}$, which we denote as$=_{B(x)}$, as follows

$$\begin{array}{ll} u =_{B(x)} v \text{ formula} & (x : A, u, v : B(x)) \\ u =_{B(x)} u & (x : A, u : B(x)) \\ u =_{B(x)} v \Longrightarrow v =_{B(x)} u & (x : A, u, v : B(x)) \\ u =_{B(x)} v \wedge v =_{B(x)} w \Longrightarrow u =_{B(x)} w & (x : A, u, v, w : B(x)) \end{array} \tag{83}$$

How do elements of $B(x)$ and $B(y)$ compare if $x =_A y$ is true? We assume that $=_A$ is associated with a proposition-type E_A as follows

$$\begin{array}{ll} E_A(x, y) \text{ type} & (x, y : A) \\ x =_A y & (x, y : A, p : E_A(x, y)) \\ x =_A y \Longrightarrow (\exists p : E_A(x, y))\top & (x, y : A) \end{array} \tag{84}$$

We now introduce transport functions tr_p to be able to relate elements of $B(x)$ and $B(y)$ when $x =_A y$

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{tr}_p(u) : B(y) & (x, y : A, p : E_A(x, y), u : B(x)) \\
u =_{B(x)} v \Longrightarrow \mathrm{tr}_p(u) =_{B(y)} \mathrm{tr}_p(v) & (x, y : A, p : E_A(x, y), u, v : B(x)) \\
\mathrm{tr}_p(u) =_{B(y)} \mathrm{tr}_q(u) & (x, y : A, p, q : E_A(x, y), u : B(x)) \\
\mathrm{tr}_p(u) =_{B(x)} u & (x : A, p : E_A(x, x), u : B(x)) \\
\mathrm{tr}_q(\mathrm{tr}_p(u)) =_{B(z)} \mathrm{tr}_r(u) & (x, y, z : A, q : E_A(y, z), p : E_A(x, y), \\
 & \quad r : E_A(x, z), u : B(x))
\end{array} \tag{85}$$

Note that second equation says that the transport function is independent of the particular value of the proof object in $E_A(x, y)$. This makes the family B over A *proof-irrelevant.*

These definitions can be extended to arbitrary contexts of setoids, see (Maietti 2009).

We may use the above to axiomatize the fibers of a function $f : C \longrightarrow A$. Let $=_C$ be denote the equality relation on C. We think now of $B(x)$ as $f^{-1}(x)$. Introduce injective functions

$$i_x(u) : C \quad (x : A, u : B(x))$$

satisfying

$$\begin{array}{ll}
i_y(\mathrm{tr}_p(u)) =_C i_x(u) & (x, y : A, p : E_A(x, y), u : B(x)) \\
u =_{B(x)} v \Longrightarrow i_x(u) =_C i_x(v) & (x : A, u, v : B(x)) \\
i_x(u) =_C i_x(v) \Longrightarrow u =_{B(x)} v & (x : A, u, v : B(x)) \\
f(w) =_A x \Longrightarrow (\exists u : B(x))\ i_x(u) =_C w & (w : C, x : A)
\end{array} \tag{86}$$

References

[1] P. Aczel. *Predicate logic with dependent sorts.* Unpublished manuscript 2004.

[2] P. Aczel. *Predicate logic over a type setup.* Slides from talk at Categorical and Homotopical Studies of Proof Theory, Barcelone, February 2008 . URL: http://mat.uab.cat/∼kock/crm/hocat/prooftheory/aczel.pdf

[3] P. Aczel. *Generalised type setups for dependently sorted logic.* Slides from talk at TACL Marseille 2011. URL: http://www.cs.man.ac.uk/∼petera/Recent-Slides/Marseille-2011-slides_pap.pdf

[4] P. Aczel. *Syntax and Semantics - another look, especially for dependent type theories.* Slides from a talk at the Newton Institute, May 10, 2012. URL: https://www.newton.ac.uk/files/seminar/20120510163017001-153074.pdf

[5] J.F. Belo. Dependently Sorted Logic. In: M. Miculan, I. Scagnetto, and F. Honsell (Eds.): *TYPES 2007,* LNCS 4941, pp. 33–50, Springer 2008.

[6] J.F. Belo. *Foundations of Dependently Sorted Logic.* PhD Thesis, Manchester 2008.

[7] A. Buisse and P. Dybjer. The interpretation of intuitionistic type theory in locally cartesian closed categories — an intuitionistic perspective. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 218(2008), 21–32.

[8] J. Cartmell. *Generalized algebraic theories and contextual categories.* DPhil. Thesis Oxford 1978.

[9] J. Cartmell. Generalized algebraic theories and contextual categories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic,* 32(1986), 209–243.

[10] P. Dybjer. Internal Type Theory. In: *Types for Proofs and Programs* (eds. S. Berardi and M. Coppo) Lecture Notes in Computer Science Volume 1158, 1996, pp 120–134.

[11] N. Gambino and P. Aczel. The generalized type-theoretic interpretation of constructive set theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 71(2006), 67–103.

[12] M. Hofmann. Syntax and semantics of dependent types. In: *Semantics and Logics of Computation* (eds. A. Pitts and P. Dybjer), Cambridge University Press 1997.

[13] J.M.E. Hyland, P.T. Johnstone and A.M. Pitts. Tripos theory. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 88(1980), 205–232.

[14] B. Jacobs. *Categorical Logic and Type Theory.* Elsevier 1999.

[15] M.E. Maietti and G. Sambin. Towards a minimalist foundation for constructive mathematics. In: *From Sets and Types to Topology and Analysis* (eds. L. Crosilla and P. Schuster) Oxford University Press 2005, 91–114.

[16] M.E. Maietti. A minimalist two-level foundation for constructive mathematics. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 160(2009), 319–354.

[17] M. Makkai. First-order logic with dependent sorts, with applications to category theory. Preprint 1995, version November 6. 201 pp. Available from Makkai's webpages.

[18] M. Makkai. Towards a categorical foundation of mathematics. In: *Logic Colloquium '95* (eds. J.A. Makowsky and E.V. Ravve) Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 11, Association for Symbolic Logic 1998, 153–190.

[19] M. Makkai. The theory of abstract sets based on first-order logic with dependent types. Preprint 2013. Available from Makkai's webpages.

[20] E. Palmgren. Constructivist and structuralist foundations: Bishop's and Lawvere's theories of sets. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic,* 163(2012), 1384–1399.

[21] E. Palmgren. Proof-relevance of families of setoids and identity in type theory. *Archive for Mathematical Logic,* 51(2012), 35–47.

[22] R.A.G. Seely. Hyperdoctrines, natural deduction and the Beck condition. *Zeitschrift für mathematisches Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik* 29(1983), 505–542.

A Appendix: Proofs

Theorem 3.3 *(Unique typing lemma) Consider derivations relative to a fixed signature Σ. Let $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_n : B_n$ be a context.*

(a) If $a : A\ (\Delta)$ and $a : A'\ (\Delta)$, then $A \equiv A'$

(b) If $(a_1, \ldots, a_n), (b_1, \ldots, b_n) : \Gamma \to \Delta$ are contexts maps, with $a_i \equiv b_i$ for each $y_i \in \mathrm{TV}(\Delta)$, then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$.

Proof. We prove (a) and (b) simultaneously, by induction on derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

(a): Case $a = x_i$: Then $a : A\ (\Delta)$ and $a : A'\ (\Delta)$ can only have been derived by (R2) so $A \equiv A_i \equiv A'$.

Case $a = f(c_1, \ldots, c_k)$: Suppose that the declaration of f in the signature Σ is

$$(\langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle, f, x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}, U)$$

and that the last lines of the respective derivations, obtained by rule (R5), are

$$f(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n / x_1, \ldots, x_n]\ (\Delta)$$

and

$$f(b_{i_1}, \ldots, b_{i_k}) : U[b_1, \ldots, b_n / x_1, \ldots, x_n]\ (\Delta)$$

where $(c_1, \ldots, c_k) \equiv (a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \equiv (b_{i_1}, \ldots, b_{i_k})$ and with shorter derivations

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle,$$

$$(b_1, \ldots, b_n) : \Delta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle.$$

Now, since $\mathrm{TV}(\langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle) \subseteq \{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}\}$, we get by the inductive hypothesis for (b) that $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$. Thus

$$U[a_1, \ldots, a_n / x_1, \ldots, x_n] \equiv U[b_1, \ldots, b_n / x_1, \ldots, x_n]$$

as required.

(b): We do secondary induction on the length of the context Δ. If the length is zero there is nothing to prove. Suppose $\Delta = y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_{n+1} : B_{n+1}$, and that

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}), (b_1, \ldots, b_{n+1}) : \Gamma \to \Delta \tag{87}$$

with

$$a_i \equiv b_i \tag{88}$$

whenever $y_i \in \mathrm{TV}(\Delta)$. We have

$$\mathrm{TV}(\Delta) = (\mathrm{TV}(y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_n : B_n) \setminus \mathrm{V}(B_{n+1})) \cup \{y_{n+1}\}. \tag{89}$$

Since y_{n+1} is a member of this set, $a_{n+1} \equiv b_{n+1}$. By assumption (87) follows

$$a_{n+1} : B_{n+1}[a_1, \ldots, a_n / y_1, \ldots, y_n] \quad (\Gamma)$$

and

$$b_{n+1} : B_{n+1}[b_1, \ldots, b_n/y_1, \ldots, y_n] \quad (\Gamma).$$

Now since $a_{n+1} \equiv b_{n+1}$, part (a) gives

$$B_{n+1}[a_1, \ldots, a_n/y_1, \ldots, y_n] \equiv B_{n+1}[b_1, \ldots, b_n/y_1, \ldots, y_n]$$

From this follows that $a_i \equiv b_i$ for each $y_i \in \mathrm{V}(B_{n+1})$. Hence by (88) and (89) it follows that $a_i \equiv b_i$ for each $y_i \in \mathrm{TV}(y_1 : B_1, \ldots, y_n : B_n)$. Thus applying the induction hypothesis for this shortening of Δ, we get

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_n).$$

Hence $(a_1, \ldots, a_{n+1}) \equiv (b_1, \ldots, b_{n+1})$ as required. □

Theorem 3.4 *(Substitution lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ. Assume that $\vdash_{\bar{\ell}} \bar{s} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$.*

(a) If $\vdash_k B$ type (Γ), then $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{\ell})} B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ type (Θ).

(b) If $\vdash_k b : B$ (Γ), then $\vdash_{k+\max(\bar{\ell})} b[\bar{s}/\Gamma] : B[\bar{s}/\Gamma]$ (Θ).

Proof. The argument goes by induction on derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Suppose that $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ and $\bar{s} = s_1, \ldots, s_n$. Then the assumption $\vdash_{\bar{\ell}} \bar{s} : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ implies that

$$\begin{array}{l} \vdash_{\ell_3} s_1 : A_1 \quad (\Theta) \\ \vdash_{\ell_4} s_2 : A_2[s_1/x_1] \quad (\Theta) \\ \quad \vdots \\ \vdash_{\ell_{n+2}} s_n : A_n[s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}] \quad (\Theta) \end{array} \tag{90}$$

Only rules R3 – R5 can be used to obtain the hypotheses of (a) and (b), so we consider those.

Rule R3: The conclusion of the rule is

$$x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n).$$

By (90) we have

$$s_i : A_i[s_1, \ldots, s_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \ (\Theta).$$

Noting again that $A_i[s_1 \ldots, s_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] = A_i[s_1, \ldots, s_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and that

$$s_i = x_i[s_1, \ldots, s_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]$$

we obtain the desired conclusion

$$x_i[s_1, \ldots, s_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] : A_i[s_1, \ldots, s_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \quad (\Theta).$$

Hence, in this case

$$\vdash_{\ell_{i+2}} b[\bar{s}/\Gamma] : B[\bar{s}/\Gamma] \ (\Theta).$$

Now $\ell_{i+2} \leq k + \max(\bar{\ell})$, so also the upper bound of proof height is established for this case.

Rule R4: Consider an application of the rule:

$$\frac{(b_1,\ldots,b_m):\Gamma \longrightarrow y_1:B_1\ldots,y_m:B_m}{S(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_q})\text{ type }(\Gamma)}\ (\text{R4}),$$

where $(y_1:B_1\ldots,y_m:B_m,i_1,\ldots,i_q,S)\in\Sigma$, and such that

$$\vdash_k S(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_q})\text{ type }(\Gamma),$$

and

$$\vdash_{\bar{r}} (b_1,\ldots,b_m):\Gamma \longrightarrow y_1:B_1\ldots,y_m:B_m. \tag{91}$$

Thus $k\geq 1+\max(\bar{r})$. For each $i=1,\ldots,m$, we have

$$\vdash_{r_{i+2}} b_i : B_i[b_1,\ldots,b_{i-1}/y_1,\ldots,y_{i-1}]\ (\Gamma).$$

By the inductive hypothesis using (91)

$$\vdash_{r_{i+2}+\max(\bar{\ell})} b_i[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n] : B_i[b_1,\ldots,b_{i-1}/y_1,\ldots,y_{i-1}][s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]\ (\Theta) \tag{92}$$

By syntactic substitution the expression in (92) is

$$\begin{array}{l} b_i[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]: \\ B_i[b_1[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n],\ldots,b_{i-1}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]/y_1,\ldots,y_{i-1}]\ (\Theta) \end{array} \tag{93}$$

Thus we may apply (R4) to (92) for $i=1,\ldots,m$ and obtain

$$\vdash_t S(b_{i_1}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n],\ldots,b_{i_q}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n])\text{ type }(\Theta)$$

where

$$t=1+\max(r_1,r_2,r_3+\max(\bar{\ell}),\ldots,r_{n+2}+\max(\bar{\ell})). \tag{94}$$

But this is nothing else than

$$\vdash_t S(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_q})[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]\text{ type }(\Theta)$$

and the estimate t is bound by

$$k+\max(\bar{\ell})\geq 1+\max(\bar{r})+\max(\bar{\ell})\geq t$$

as desired.

Rule R5: An application of the rule looks like this:

$$\frac{(b_1,\ldots,b_m):\Gamma \longrightarrow y_1:B_1\ldots,y_m:B_m \quad U[b_1,\ldots,b_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\text{ type }(\Gamma)}{f(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_q}):U[b_1,\ldots,b_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\ (\Gamma)}\ (\text{R5})$$

where $(y_1:B_1\ldots,y_m:B_m,f,i_1,\ldots,i_q,U)\in\Sigma$. By inductive hypothesis and the property of substitution we have, exactly as above, (93) for all $i=1,\ldots,m$. Moreover the inductive hypothesis and substitution property gives

$$U[b_1[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n],\ldots,b_m[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\text{ type }(\Theta).$$

Thus applying (R5) to these judgements, one obtains

$$\begin{array}{l}\vdash_t f(b_{i_1}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n],\ldots,b_{i_q}[s_1\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]):\\ \quad U[b_{i_1}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n],\ldots,b_{i_q}[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]/y_1,\ldots,y_m]\ (\Theta)\end{array} \tag{95}$$

which is the same as

$$\begin{array}{l}\vdash_t f(b_{i_1},\ldots,b_{i_k})[s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]:\\ \quad U[b_1,\ldots,b_m/y_1,\ldots,y_m][s_1,\ldots,s_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]\ (\Theta)\end{array} \tag{96}$$

which gives the required conclusion, as $k+\max(\bar{\ell}) \geq t$. $\Box$

Theorem 3.5 *(Weakening lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ with unrestricted variable system. Suppose that $\vdash B$ type (Γ). Let y be a variable not in $\mathrm{V}(\Gamma,\Theta)$.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma,\Theta$ context, then $\vdash \Gamma, y:B,\Theta$ context

(b) If $\vdash A$ type (Γ,Θ), then $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y:B,\Theta)$

(c) If $\vdash a:A\ (\Gamma,\Theta)$, then $\vdash a:A\ (\Gamma, y:B,\Theta)$

Proof. Induction on derivations. Note that $x \in \varphi(FV(\Delta))$ is equivalent to $x \in V \setminus FV(\Delta)$.

Rule R1. The conclusion is $\langle\rangle$ context, so Γ and Δ must be empty contexts. We have by assumption B type $()$, so we can conclude

$$y:B \text{ context}$$

as desired.

Rule R2. The rule application has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma,\Theta' \text{ context} \quad A \text{ type } (\Gamma,\Theta')}{\Gamma,\Theta', x:A \text{ context}}\ (\mathrm{R2})$$

where $\Theta = \Theta', x:A$, and $x \notin \mathrm{V}(\Gamma,\Theta')$. Now $y \notin \mathrm{V}(\Gamma,\Theta') \supseteq \mathrm{V}(\Gamma,\Theta)$, so we have by inductive hypothesis

$$\Gamma, y:B,\Theta' \text{ context and } A \text{ type } (\Gamma, y:B,\Theta').$$

Clearly y is not in $\mathrm{V}(\Gamma,\Theta)$ so R2 may be applied to obtain

$$\Gamma, y:B,\Theta', x:A \text{ context}$$

as required.

Rule R3. Let rule application have the form

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n)} \text{ (R3)}$$

where $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_j : A_j$ and $\Theta = x_{j+1} : A_{j+1} \ldots, x_n : A_n$. By inductive hypothesis

$$x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_j : A_j, y : B, x_{j+1} : A_{j+1} \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}.$$

By applying R3 we obtain the desired

$$x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_j : A_j, y : B, x_{j+1} : A_{j+1} \ldots, x_n : A_n).$$

Rule R4. Suppose we have the rule instance

$$\frac{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, \Theta \longrightarrow \Delta}{S(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \text{ type } (\Gamma, \Theta)} \text{ (R4)}$$

where $(\Delta, i_1, \ldots, i_k, S) \in \Sigma$. Invocation of the inductive hypotheses gives us the premisses of the rule but where Γ, Θ have been replaced by $\Gamma, y : B, \Theta$. By R4 we may thus conclude

$$S(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \text{ type } (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$$

as required.

Rule R5. Suppose we have the application

$$\frac{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, \Theta \longrightarrow \Delta \quad U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \text{ type } (\Gamma, \Theta)}{f(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \ (\Gamma, \Theta)} \text{ (R5)}$$

where $(\Delta, i_1, \ldots, i_k, f, U) \in \Sigma$. Again, invocation of the inductive hypotheses gives us the premisses of the rule but where Γ, Θ have been replaced by $\Gamma, y : B, \Theta$. By R5 we may thus conclude

$$f(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/\Delta] \ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$$

as desired.

This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 3.6 *(Strengthening lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ unrestricted variable system. Let y be a variable not in $\mathrm{V}(\Theta, A, a)$.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma, y : B, \Theta$ context*, then* $\vdash \Gamma, \Theta$ context*.*

(b) If $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash A$ type (Γ, Θ)*.*

(c) If $\vdash a : A \ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)$*, then* $\vdash a : A \ (\Gamma, \Theta)$*.*

Proof. Induction on derivations.

Rule R1. The conclusion is $\langle\rangle$ context so this case does not apply.

Rule R2. In case Θ is empty the rule application has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ context} \qquad B \text{ type } (\Gamma)}{\Gamma, y : B \text{ context}} \text{ (R2)}$$

where $y \in V \setminus \mathrm{V}(\Gamma)$. Thus we have

$$\Gamma \text{ context}$$

by a shorter derivation.

In case $\Theta = y : B, \Theta'$ is not empty, the rule application has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma, y : B, \Theta' \text{ context} \qquad A \text{ type } (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta')}{\Gamma, y : B, \Theta', x : A \text{ context}} \text{ (R2)}$$

where $x \in V \setminus \mathrm{V}(\Gamma, B, \Theta')$. By inductive hypothesis we have

$$\Gamma, \Theta' \text{ context} \qquad A \text{ type } (\Gamma, \Theta')$$

so applying (R2) to this we get the desired judgement

$$\Gamma, \Theta', x : A \text{ context}$$

Rule R3. Suppose rule application has the form

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n)} \text{ (R3)}$$

where $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_{j-1} : A_{j-1}$, $x_j : A_j = y : B$ and $\Theta = x_{j+1} : A_{j+1} \ldots, x_n : A_n$. Now $y \, (= x_j)$ is not in $\mathrm{V}(\Theta, A_i, x_i)$. By inductive hypothesis

$$\Gamma, \Theta \text{ context}$$

and

$$A_i \text{ type } (\Gamma, \Theta).$$

In particular by the variable condition $i \neq j$, so we can apply (R3) to obtain the desired

$$x_i : A_i \ (\Gamma, \Theta).$$

Rule R4. Suppose we have the rule instance

$$\frac{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, y : B, \Theta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle}{S(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \text{ type } (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)} \text{ (R4)}$$

where $(\langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle, 1, \ldots, n, S) \in \Sigma$. Reading out the assumption $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, y : B, \Theta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$ it says that

$$\Gamma, y : B, \Theta \text{ context} \tag{97}$$

and for $i = 1, \ldots, n$

$$a_i : A_i[a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta). \tag{98}$$

By assumption y is not in $\mathrm{V}(\Theta, S(a_1, \ldots, a_n))$. Here we use the fact that the signature is on standard form. Thus y is not in $\mathrm{V}(\Theta, a_i, A_i[a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}])$, so by inductive hypothesis:

$$\Gamma, \Theta \text{ context}$$

and for $i = 1, \ldots, n$

$$a_i : A_i[a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \ (\Gamma, \Theta).$$

We can then apply R4 to obtain

$$S(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \text{ type } (\Gamma, \Theta)$$

as desired.

Rule R5. Suppose we have the application

$$\frac{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, y : B, \Theta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle}{f(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \ (\Gamma, y : B, \Theta)} \ \text{(R5)}$$

where $(\langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle, f, 1, \ldots, n, U) \in \Sigma$. Spelling out the assumption about the context map, we get as above (97) and (98). By assumption y is not in

$$\mathrm{V}(\Theta, f(a_1, \ldots, a_n), U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = \mathrm{V}(\Theta, a_1, \ldots, a_n, U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]).$$

Thus we can apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain

$$\Gamma, \Theta \text{ context}$$

and

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : \Gamma, \Theta \longrightarrow \langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle.$$

Thus applying R5, we obtain

$$f(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : U[a_1, \ldots, a_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n] \ (\Gamma, \Theta)$$

This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 3.7 *(Interchange lemma) Consider derivations in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ for a fixed signature Σ with unrestricted variable system. Suppose that $x \notin \mathrm{V}(C)$.*

(a) If $\vdash \Gamma, x; B, y : C, \Theta$ context, then $\vdash \Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta$ context.

(b) If $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta)$, then $\vdash A$ type $(\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta)$.

(c) If $\vdash a : A \ (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta)$, then $\vdash a : A \ (\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta)$.

Proof. Induction on derivations.

Rule R1. The conclusion is $\langle\rangle$ context and hence this case does not apply.

Rule R2. In case Θ is empty the rule application has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : B \text{ context} \quad C \text{ type } (\Gamma, x : B)}{\Gamma, x : B, y : C \text{ context}} \text{ (R2)}$$

where $y \in V \setminus \mathrm{V}(\Gamma, x : B)$. Using the Strengthening lemma on C type $(\Gamma, x : B)$, we obtain C type (Γ). As $y \notin \mathrm{V}(B)$, the Weakening lemma on $\Gamma, x : B$ context gives

$$\Gamma, y : C, x : B \text{ context}$$

as required. Assume now that $\Theta = \Theta', z : A$. Then the rule application has the form

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta' \text{ context} \quad A \text{ type } (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta')}{\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta', z : A \text{ context}} \text{ (R2)}$$

where $z \in V \setminus \mathrm{V}(\Gamma, x : B, , y : C, \Theta')$. Applying the inductive hypothesis to the premisses, and then applying R2 gives the required result.

Rule R3. Suppose the rule application has the form

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n)} \text{ (R3)}$$

where $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_{j-2} : A_{j-2}$, $x_{j-1} : A_{j-1} = x : B$, $x_j : A_j = y : C$, and $\Theta = x_{j+1} : A_{j+1} \ldots, x_n : A_n$. By inductive hypothesis

$$\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta \text{ context} \qquad A_i \text{ type } (\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta).$$

An application of R3 gives

$$x_i : A_i \ (\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta).$$

Rule R4. Assume that the rule application is

$$\frac{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) : (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta) \longrightarrow \Delta}{S(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \text{ type } (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta)} \text{ (R4)}$$

where $(\Delta, S, i_1, \ldots, i_k) \in \Sigma$ and $\Delta = \langle x_1 : A_1 \ldots, x_n : A_n \rangle$. Spelling out the assumption on the context map it says

$$\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta \text{ context} \tag{99}$$

and for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$a_i : A_i[a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \ (\Gamma, x : B, y : C, \Theta). \tag{100}$$

By inductive hypothesis we can switch $x : B$ and $y : C$ in these judgements and apply R4 to achieve

$$S(a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \text{ type } (\Gamma, y : C, x : B, \Theta)$$

Rule R5. Suppose we have the rule application

$$\frac{(a_1,\ldots,a_n):\Gamma,x:B,y:C,\Theta\longrightarrow\Delta \quad U[a_1,\ldots,a_n/\Delta]\text{ type }(\Gamma,x:B,y:C,\Theta)}{f(a_{i_1},\ldots,a_{i_k}):U[a_1,\ldots,a_n/\Delta]\ (\Gamma,x:B,y:C,\Theta)}\ (\text{R5})$$

where $(\Delta,f,i_1,\ldots,i_k,U)\in\Sigma$ and $\Delta=\langle x_1:A_1\ldots,x_n:A_n\rangle$. Reading out the assumption on the context map gives as above (99) and (100). By inductive assumption we can again switch $x:B$ and $y:C$ in the judgements and thereby get

$$(a_1,\ldots,a_n):\Gamma,y:C,x:B,\Theta\longrightarrow\langle x_1:A_1\ldots,x_n:A_n\rangle$$

and

$$U[a_1,\ldots,a_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]\text{ type }(\Gamma,y:C,x:B,\Theta).$$

Hence by R5 we obtain:

$$f(a_{i_1},\ldots,a_{i_k}):U[a_1,\ldots,a_n/x_1,\ldots,x_n]\ (\Gamma,y:C,x:B,\Theta),$$

as was required. □

Lemma 3.17 *Suppose that Σ is a signature such that $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)=\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Assume that $D=(\Delta,f,\bar{i},U)$ is a predeclaration, where f is not declared in Σ, and where $(U\text{ type }(\Delta))\in\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. Then for $\Sigma'=\Sigma\cup\{D\}$*

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma')=\mathcal{J}(\Sigma').$$

Proof. The $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma')\supseteq\mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ is direct as observed above. We prove $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma')\subseteq\mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$. Denote by R the application of R5* with the function symbol f. The proof goes by double induction on the property $P(m,n)$:

$$\forall\mathcal{U}(\Sigma'\vdash^{*,R}_m\mathcal{U}\ \&\ \Sigma'\vdash^{*}_n\mathcal{U}\Longrightarrow\Sigma'\vdash\mathcal{U}).$$

Note that for $m=0$, $\Sigma'\vdash^{*,R}_m\mathcal{U}$ implies that R is not used so $\Sigma\vdash\mathcal{U}$. Hence by the assumption $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)=\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, we have $\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)\subseteq\mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ as required.

To prove the inductive step assume that $\forall n\ P(m,n)$. We prove $\forall n\ P(m+1,n)$. For $n=0$, $\Sigma'\vdash^{*}_n\mathcal{U}$ implies that $\mathcal{U}=(\langle\rangle\text{ context})$, so trivially $\Sigma'\vdash\mathcal{U}$. Now assume that $P(m+1,n)$ holds. We show that $P(m+1,n+1)$: assume that

$$\Sigma'\vdash^{*,R}_{m+1}\mathcal{U} \tag{101}$$

$$\Sigma'\vdash^{*}_{n+1}\mathcal{U}. \tag{102}$$

We establish $\Sigma'\vdash\mathcal{U}$ by case distinction on the last rule applied.

Rule (R1): Then $\mathcal{U}=(\langle\rangle\text{ context})$, so trivially $\Sigma'\vdash\mathcal{U}$.

Rule (R2): Suppose that this last rule application is

$$\frac{\Gamma\text{ context}\quad A\text{ type }(\Gamma)}{\Gamma,x:A\text{ context}}\ .$$

Then $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m+1} \Gamma$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m+1} A$ type (Γ). Also $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} \Gamma$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} A$ type (Γ). By $P(m+1,n)$ we get $\Sigma' \vdash \Gamma$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash A$ type (Γ). Thus using (R2)

$$\Sigma' \vdash \Gamma, x : A \text{ context}$$

as required.

Rule (R3): Assume the last rule application gives

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n).}$$

Then $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m+1} x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ context. By $P(m+1,n)$ we get $\Sigma' \vdash x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ context. Hence applying (R3) yields

$$\Sigma' \vdash x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n).$$

Rule (R4): Suppose the last rule application is

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) \text{ type } (\Gamma)} \ \ (\Delta, S, \bar{i}) \text{ in } \Sigma \quad .$$

Then $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m+1} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$. By $P(m+1,n)$ this gives $\Sigma' \vdash \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$. Hence by (R4): $\Sigma' \vdash S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}})$ type (Γ).

Rule (R5*): Next assume the last rule application is

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'}{f'(\bar{a}_{\bar{j}}) : U'[\bar{a}/\Delta'] \ (\Gamma)} \ \ (\Delta', f', \bar{j}, U') \text{ in } \Sigma'$$

If $f' \neq f$ we have $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m+1} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$ and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$. By $P(m+1,n)$ this gives $\Sigma' \vdash \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$. Since $f' \neq f$, we must have $(\Delta', f', \bar{j}, U') \in \Sigma$. Thus $\Sigma \vdash U'$ type (Δ'), since $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. We can now use the Substitution Lemma to obtain $\Sigma' \vdash U'[\bar{a}/\Delta']$ type (Γ). Now using (R5) we get as desired $\Sigma' \vdash f'(\bar{a}_{\bar{j}}) : U'[\bar{a}/\Delta']$ type (Γ).

If $f' = f$, then $\Delta' = \Delta$ and $\bar{j} = \bar{i}$, and we have $\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{m} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$ and $\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{n} \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$. Since $(U \text{ type } (\Delta)) \in \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$, no applications of R are need, so

$$\Sigma \vdash^{*,R}_{0} U \text{ type } (\Delta)$$

and further, for some k:

$$\Sigma \vdash^{*}_{k} U \text{ type } (\Delta).$$

By the Substitution Lemmas we have

$$\Sigma' \vdash^{*,R}_{0+m} U[\bar{a}/\Delta] \text{ type } (\Gamma)$$

and

$$\Sigma' \vdash^{*}_{k+m} U[\bar{a}/\Delta] \text{ type } (\Gamma).$$

Applying $P(m, k+m)$, we obtain

$$\Sigma' \vdash U[\bar{a}/\Delta] \text{ type } (\Gamma).$$

Now using (R5) we get

$$\Sigma' \vdash f'(\bar{a}_{\bar{j}}) : U'[\bar{a}/\Delta'] \text{ type } (\Gamma)$$

as desired. □

Lemma 3.18 *Suppose that Σ is a signature such that $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Assume that $D = (\Delta, \bar{i}, S)$ is a predeclaration, where S is not declared in Σ, and where $(\Delta \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. Then for $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{D\}$*

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma') = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma').$$

Proof. The $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma') \supseteq \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$ is direct as observed above. We prove $\mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma') \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\Sigma')$. The proof goes by double induction on the property $P(n)$:

$$\forall \mathcal{U}(\Sigma' \vdash^*_n \mathcal{U} \Longrightarrow \Sigma' \vdash \mathcal{U}).$$

For $n = 0$, $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n \mathcal{U}$ implies that $\mathcal{U} = (\langle\rangle \text{ context})$, so trivially $\Sigma' \vdash \mathcal{U}$. Now assume that $P(n)$ holds. We show that $P(n+1)$: assume that

$$\Sigma' \vdash^*_{n+1} \mathcal{U}. \tag{103}$$

We establish $\Sigma' \vdash \mathcal{U}$ by case distinction on the last rule applied.

Rule (R1): Then $\mathcal{U} = (\langle\rangle \text{ context})$, so trivially $\Sigma' \vdash \mathcal{U}$.

Rule (R2): Suppose that this last rule application is

$$\frac{\Gamma \text{ context} \quad A \text{ type } (\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}}.$$

Then Also $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n \Gamma$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n A$ type (Γ). By $P(n)$ we get $\Sigma' \vdash \Gamma$ context and $\Sigma' \vdash A$ type (Γ). Thus using (R2)

$$\Sigma' \vdash \Gamma, x : A \text{ context}$$

as required.

Rule (R3): Assume the last rule application gives

$$\frac{x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n \text{ context}}{x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n)}.$$

Then $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ context. By $P(n)$ we get $\Sigma' \vdash x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$ context. Hence applying (R3) yields

$$\Sigma' \vdash x_i : A_i \ (x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n).$$

Rule (R4): Suppose the last rule application is

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}}) \text{ type } (\Gamma)} \quad (\Delta, S, \bar{i}) \text{ in } \Sigma \quad .$$

Then $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$. By $P(n)$ this gives $\Sigma' \vdash \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$. Hence by (R4): $\Sigma' \vdash S(\bar{a}_{\bar{i}})$ type (Γ).

Rule (R5*): Next assume the last rule application is

$$\frac{\bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'}{f(\bar{a}_{\bar{j}}) : U[\bar{a}/\Delta'] \ (\Gamma)} \quad (\Delta', f, \bar{j}, U) \text{ in } \Sigma'$$

We have $\Sigma' \vdash^*_n \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$. By $P(n)$ this gives $\Sigma' \vdash \bar{a} : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta'$. We must have $(\Delta', f, \bar{j}, U) \in \Sigma$. Thus $\Sigma \vdash U$ type (Δ'), since $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{J}^*(\Sigma)$. We can now use the Substitution Lemma to obtain $\Sigma' \vdash U[\bar{a}/\Delta']$ type (Γ). Now using (R5) we get

$$\Sigma' \vdash f(\bar{a}_{\bar{j}}) : U[\bar{a}/\Delta'] \text{ type } (\Gamma).$$

as desired. □

Theorem 4.1 *For any FOLDS vocabulary K, the pre-signature Σ_K is a signature.*

Proof. To prove the theorem it is enough to prove that for each $k = 1, \ldots, N$, the pre-context Γ_{B_k} is a context relative to the signature $\{\mathcal{D}_{B_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_{B_{k-1}}\}$. For $k = 1$, $n(B_1) = 0$, so Γ_{B_1} is the empty context, and hence $\mathcal{D}_{B_1}$ is a type declaration relative to the empty signature []. Suppose the statement holds for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$. We show $\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}$ is a context relative to the signature $\{\mathcal{D}_{B_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_{B_m}\}$. By construction

$$\Gamma_{B_{m+1}} = x_1 : C_1(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_1})^{x_1}), \ldots, x_n : C_n(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_n})^{x_n}) \tag{104}$$

where $x_i = x_i^{B_{m+1}}$, $C_i = \mathrm{cod}(x_i)$ and $n = n(B_{m+1})$. We prove by induction that each initial segment of (104) is a context

$$\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_k \ \text{ context} \tag{105}$$

relative to $\{\mathcal{D}_{B_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_{B_m}\}$ where $k = 0, \ldots, n$. For $k = 0$, this is clear. Suppose (105) holds for all $k = 0, \ldots, r$. To prove $\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_{r+1}$ context, it suffices to prove

$$C_{r+1}(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_{r+1}})^{x_{r+1}}) \text{ type} \qquad (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r)$$

Since $C_{r+1} <^* B_{m+1}$, we have that $D_{C_{r+1}}$ is declared in $\{\mathcal{D}_{B_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_{B_m}\}$, and hence it is enough to prove that the following is a context map

$$\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_{r+1}})^{x_{r+1}} : (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \to \Gamma_{C_{r+1}}. \tag{106}$$

Now suppose that

$$\Gamma_{C_{r+1}} = y_1 : D_1(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_1})^{y_1}), \ldots, y_s : D_s(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_s})^{y_s}) \tag{107}$$

where $y_i = x_i^{C_{r+1}}$, $D_i = \mathrm{cod}(y_i)$ and $s = n(C_{r+1})$. Note that $s \leq r$. As

$$\mathrm{V}(D_i(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_i})^{y_i})) \subseteq \{y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}\},$$

we can write

$$y_{f(i,1)}, \ldots, y_{f(i,t(i))} =_{\text{def}} \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_i})^{y_i} \tag{108}$$

where $f(i,k) \in \{y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}\}$ and $t(i) \leq i-1$. Spelling out (106) as basic judgements it becomes the conjunction of the following judgements

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(C) & \Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r \text{ context} \\
(E_1) & y_1 x_{r+1} : D_1(y_{f(1,1)}, \ldots, y_{f(1,t(1))})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
(E_2) & y_2 x_{r+1} : D_2(y_{f(2,1)}, \ldots, y_{f(2,t(2))})[y_1 x_{r+1}/y_1]\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
(E_s) & y_s x_{r+1} : D_s(y_{f(s,1)}, \ldots, y_{f(s,t(s))})[y_1 x_{r+1}, \ldots, y_{s-1} x_{r+1}/y_1, \ldots, y_{s-1}]\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r)
\end{array}$$

First (C) follows from the inductive hypothesis. By performing the syntactic substitutions, the problem is reduced to proving

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(E_1) & y_1 x_{r+1} : D_1(y_{f(1,1)}, \ldots, y_{f(1,t(1))})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
(E_2) & y_2 x_{r+1} : D_2(y_{f(2,1)} x_{r+1}, \ldots, y_{f(2,t(2))} x_{r+1})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
(E_s) & y_s x_{r+1} : D_s(y_{f(s,1)} x_{r+1}, \ldots, y_{f(s,t(s))} x_{r+1})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r)
\end{array}$$

By the form of (107) it follows that $t(1) = 0$, and

$$D_1 \text{ type} \quad ().$$

Hence by weakening

$$D_1 \text{ type} \quad (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r).$$

As $y_1 x_{r+1} : B_{m+1} \to D_1$ is a non-identity map, there must be some x_j with $x_j = y_1 x_{r+1}$. Let j be the smallest such. We have $D_1 = C_j$. Moreover $D_1 <^* C_{r+1}$, so $j \leq r$. Thus

$$y_1 x_{r+1} : D_1 \quad (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r).$$

This verifies (E_1).

For every $i = 1, \ldots, s$, we have a non-identity arrow $y_i x_{r+1}$ from B_{m+1} to D_i via C_{r+1}. Since $D_i <^* C_{r+1}$ there is $g : \{1, \ldots, s\} \to \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that

$$x_{g(i)} = y_i x_{r+1} \qquad C_{g(i)} = D_i.$$

Now since $i < j$ implies $C_{g(i)} <^* C_{g(j)}$ it follows that g is strictly increasing. The remaining problem is now to check that

$$\begin{array}{ll}
(E_1) & x_{g(1)} : C_{g(1)}\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
(E_2) & x_{g(2)} : C_{g(2)}(x_{g(f(2,1))}, \ldots, x_{g(f(2,t(2)))})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r) \\
 & \quad \vdots \\
(E_s) & x_{g(s)} : C_{g(s)}(x_{g(f(s,1))}, \ldots, x_{g(f(s,t(s)))})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r)
\end{array}$$

Case (E_1) follows by the above. Let $i \in \{2, \ldots, s\}$. We prove (E_i):

$$x_{g(i)} : C_{g(i)}(x_{g(f(i,1))}, \ldots, x_{g(f(i,t(i)))})\ (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{g(i)}(x_{g(f(i,1))},\ldots,x_{g(f(i,t(i)))}) &= D_i(y_{f(i,1)}x_{r+1},\ldots,y_{f(i,t(i))}x_{r+1}) \\ &= D_i(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_i})^{y_i})^{x_{r+1}} \\ &= D_i(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{D_i})^{x_{g(i)}}) \\ &= C_{g(i)}(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_{g(i)}})^{x_{g(i)}}) \end{aligned}$$

By (107) we have

$$x_{g(i)} : C_{g(i)}(\mathrm{OV}(\Gamma_{C_{g(i)}})^{x_{g(i)}}) \qquad (\Gamma_{B_{m+1}}|_r)$$

so we are done. □

Lemma 5.3 *Suppose that Σ is a signature, and that $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow V$ is a fresh sequence of variables. If $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, then variable ordering σ for Γ forms a context map*

$$(\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma),$$

whose inverse $(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, is given by $\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. First we prove $\sigma(\Gamma)$ is a context map. This is proved by induction on derivations using the Substitution lemma above: case (R1) is trivial. Suppose $(\Gamma, x : A \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Then by shorter derivations $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and $(A \text{ type } (\Gamma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Hence by inductive hypothesis $(\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Thus by the Substitution lemma $(A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma] \text{ type } (\Gamma^\sigma)) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. Also by inductive hypothesis $(\Gamma^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. So by (R2) and $\sigma(|\Gamma|) \in \mathrm{Fresh}(\Gamma^\sigma)$,

$$(\langle \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma). \tag{109}$$

Thus $(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle^\sigma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. By (109), and (R3) follows

$$\sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\ \big(\langle \Gamma^\sigma, \sigma(|\Gamma|) : A[\sigma(\Gamma)/\Gamma]\rangle\big). \tag{110}$$

Then by $(\sigma(\Gamma) : \Gamma^\sigma \longrightarrow \Gamma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$ and (110) it follows that

$$(\sigma(\langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle) : \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle^\sigma \longrightarrow \langle \Gamma, x : A\rangle) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$$

as required.

Next we show that for $(\Gamma \text{ context}) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\Gamma) \circ \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) &= 1_{\Gamma^\sigma}, \\ \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \sigma(\Gamma) &= 1_\Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \ldots, x_n : A_n$, so

$$\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma) = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$$

Then

$$\sigma(\Gamma) = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \mathrm{OV}(\Gamma^\sigma)$$

where

$$y_k = \sigma(k)$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\Gamma) \circ \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) &= (y_1[x_1, \ldots, x_n/y_1, \ldots, y_n], \ldots, y_n[x_1, \ldots, x_n/y_1, \ldots, y_n]) \\ &= (x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1_\Gamma. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) \circ \sigma(\Gamma) &= (x_1[y_1, \ldots, y_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n], \ldots, x_n[y_1, \ldots, y_n/x_1, \ldots, x_n]) \\ &= (y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 1_{\Gamma^\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we prove that $(\sigma^{-1}(\Gamma) : \Gamma \longrightarrow \Gamma^\sigma) \in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$. With the above notation

$$\Gamma^\sigma = y_1 : A_1, y_2 : A_2[y_1/x_1], \ldots, y_n : A_n[y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}].$$

Since both (Γ context), (Γ^σ context) $\in \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$, we need only to show in $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 : A_1 \ (\Gamma) \\ x_2 : A_2[y_1/x_1][x_1/y_1] \ (\Gamma) \\ \quad \vdots \\ x_n : A_n[y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}/x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}][x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}/y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}] \ (\Gamma) \end{array} \tag{111}$$

But each of the substitutions cancel so the judgements follow by the assumption rules. □

Theorem 5.3 *The cwfs and cwf morphisms form a category.*

Proof. We first check that composition as defined above is well-defined. We have

$$(F' \circ F)(\top_{\mathcal{C}}) = F'(\top_{\mathcal{C}'}) = \top_{\mathcal{C}''}.$$

Suppose $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, and $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Delta(A\{f\}) &= \sigma'_{F(\Delta)}(\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})) \\ &= \sigma'_{F(\Delta)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(f)\}) \\ &= \sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))\{F'(F(f))\} \\ &= (\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A)\{(F' \circ F)(f))\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (F' \circ F)(\Gamma.A) &= F'(F(\Gamma).\sigma_\Gamma(A)) \\ &= F'(F(\Gamma)).\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)) \\ &= (F' \circ F)(\Gamma).(\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(F' \circ F)(\mathrm{p}_\Gamma(A)) &= F'(\mathrm{p}_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))) \\ &= \mathrm{p}_{F'(F(\Gamma))}(\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))) \\ &= \mathrm{p}_{(F'\circ F)(\Gamma)}((\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A))\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}((\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Gamma,A}(a))\{(F' \circ F)(f)\} &= (\theta'_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)}(\theta_{\Gamma,A}(a)))\{(F'(F(f))\} \\ &= \theta'_{F(\Delta),\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})}(\theta_{\Gamma,A}(a)\{F(f)\}) \\ &= \theta'_{F(\Delta),\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})}(\theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a\{f\})) \\ &= (\theta' \circ \theta)_{F(\Delta),\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})}(a\{f\}) \\ &= (\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a\{f\})\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Gamma.A,A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}}(\mathrm{v}_A) &= \theta'_{F(\Gamma.A),\sigma_{\Gamma.A}(A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})}(\theta_{\Gamma.A,A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}}(\mathrm{v}_A)) \\ &= \theta'_{F(\Gamma.A),\sigma_{\Gamma.A}(A\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})}(\mathrm{v}_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)}) \\ &= \mathrm{v}_{\sigma_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))} \\ &= \mathrm{v}_{(\sigma'\circ\sigma)_\Gamma(A)}.\end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$ and $a \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Delta, A\{f\})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(F' \circ F)(\langle f, a\rangle_A) &= F'(\big\langle F(f), \theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a)\big\rangle_{\sigma_\Gamma(A)}) \\ &= \big\langle F'(F(f)), \theta_{F(\Delta),\sigma_\Gamma(A)\{F(f)\}}(\theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a))\big\rangle_{\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))} \\ &= \big\langle F'(F(f)), \theta'_{F(\Delta),\sigma_\Delta(A\{f\})}(\theta_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a))\big\rangle_{\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))} \\ &= \big\langle (F' \circ F)(f), (\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Delta,A\{f\}}(a)\big\rangle_{(\sigma'\circ\sigma)_\Gamma(A)}\end{aligned}$$

This proves that the composition of two cwf morphisms is again a cwf morphism. The identity laws

$$(I_{\mathcal{C}'}, \iota^{\mathcal{C}'}, \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}'}) \circ (F, \sigma, \theta) = (F, \sigma, \theta) \tag{112}$$

and

$$(F, \sigma, \theta) \circ (I_{\mathcal{C}}, \iota^{\mathcal{C}}, \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}}) = (F, \sigma, \theta) \tag{113}$$

These hold obviously for the functor components of the equalities. As for (112) we

$$(\iota^{\mathcal{C}'} \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A) = \iota^{\mathcal{C}'}_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)) = 1_{\mathrm{Ty}(F(\Gamma))}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)) = \sigma_\Gamma(A),$$

and

$$(\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}'} \circ \theta)_{\Gamma,A} = \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}'}_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A} = 1_{\mathrm{Tm}F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A} = \theta_{\Gamma,A}$$

As for (113) we have similarly

$$(\sigma \circ \iota^{\mathcal{C}})_\Gamma(A) = \sigma_{I(\Gamma)}(\iota^{\mathcal{C}}_\Gamma(A)) = \sigma_\Gamma(1_{\mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)}(A)) = \sigma_\Gamma(A),$$

$$(\theta \circ \varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}})_{\Gamma,A} = \theta_{I(\Gamma),\iota_\Gamma(A)} \circ \varepsilon_{\Gamma,A} = \theta_{\Gamma,A} \circ 1_{\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma,A)} = \theta_{\Gamma,A}.$$

To prove associativity assume that $(F'', \sigma'', \theta'') : (\mathcal{C}'', \mathrm{Ty}'', \mathrm{Tm}'') \longrightarrow (\mathcal{C}''', \mathrm{Ty}''', \mathrm{Tm}''')$ is a third cwf morphism. We shall thus show

$$((F'', \sigma'', \theta'') \circ (F', \sigma', \theta')) \circ (F, \sigma, \theta) = (F'', \sigma'', \theta'') \circ ((F', \sigma', \theta') \circ (F, \sigma, \theta)).$$

The equality of the first component is just associativity of functor composition. The second component equality is

$$\begin{aligned} ((\sigma'' \circ \sigma') \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A) &= (\sigma'' \circ \sigma')_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A)) \\ &= \sigma''_{F'(F(\Gamma))}(\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))) \\ &= \sigma''_{(F' \circ F)(\Gamma)}((\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A)) \\ &= (\sigma'' \circ (\sigma' \circ \sigma))_\Gamma(A) \end{aligned}$$

The third equality is given by

$$\begin{aligned} ((\theta'' \circ \theta') \circ \theta)_{\Gamma,A} &= (\theta'' \circ \theta')_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A} \\ &= (\theta''_{F'(F(\Gamma)),\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))} \circ \theta'_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)}) \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A} \\ &= \theta''_{F'(F(\Gamma)),\sigma'_{F(\Gamma)}(\sigma_\Gamma(A))} \circ (\theta'_{F(\Gamma),\sigma_\Gamma(A)} \circ \theta_{\Gamma,A}) \\ &= \theta''_{(F' \circ F)(\Gamma),(\sigma' \circ \sigma)_\Gamma(A)} \circ (\theta' \circ \theta)_{\Gamma,A} \\ &= (\theta'' \circ (\theta' \circ \theta))_{\Gamma,A} \end{aligned}$$

□

B Appendix: Type constructions on cwfs

We shall consider the type constructions Π, Σ, $+$ and N_k below.

A CwF *supports* N_k*-types* if for every $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ there is $\mathrm{N}_{k,\Gamma} \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and k elements

$$0_{k,\Gamma}, \ldots, (k-1)_{k,\Gamma} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \mathrm{N}_{k,\Gamma}) \tag{114}$$

such that for any $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$,

(N_k-subst) $\mathrm{N}_{k,\Gamma}\{f\} = \mathrm{N}_{k,\Delta}$

(i_k-subst) $i_{k,\Gamma}\{f\} = i_{k,\Delta}$.

Moreover for any $C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_{k,\Gamma})$ and any $M_i \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, i_{k,\Gamma}\rangle\})$ $(i = 0, \ldots, k-1)$ and any $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \mathrm{N}_{k,\Gamma})$, there is

$$\mathrm{R}_{k,\Gamma,C}(P, M_0, \ldots, M_{k-1}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle\} \tag{115}$$

which is such that

(N_k-conv) $\mathrm{R}_{k,\Gamma,C}(i_{k,\Gamma}, M_0, \ldots, M_{k-1}) = M_i$

and for $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$,

(N_k-subst) $\mathrm{R}_{k,\Gamma,C}(P, M_0, \ldots, M_{k-1})\{f\} = \mathrm{R}_{k,\Delta,C\{\mathrm{q}(f)\}}(P\{f\}, M_0\{f\}, \ldots, M_{k-1}\{f\})$.

Lemma B.1 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf that supports N_0 and N_1. Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$.*

(a) $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0, A\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_0)\})$ *is inhabited,*

(b) $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \mathrm{N}_1\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$ *is inhabited.*

Proof. As for (a): Let $C = A\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0})\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0,0})\}$. So $C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0.\mathrm{N}_0)$. Now,

$$v_{\mathrm{N}_0} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0}, \mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0}\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0})\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0}, \mathrm{N}_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0,0}).$$

So by N_0-elimination (115)

$$\mathrm{R}_{0,\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0,C}(v_{\mathrm{N}_0}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0, C\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0}, v_{\mathrm{N}_0}\rangle\}).$$

But

$$C\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0}, v_{\mathrm{N}_0}\rangle\} = A\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0})\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0,0})\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0}, v_{\mathrm{N}_0}\rangle\} = A\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_{\Gamma,0})\}$$

Hence $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\mathrm{N}_0, A\{\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{N}_0)\})$ is inhabited.

As for (b): By N_1-introduction (114),

$$0_{1,\Gamma.A} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \mathrm{N}_{\Gamma.A,1}).$$

Since $\mathrm{N}_{1,\Gamma}\{\mathrm{p}(A)\} = \mathrm{N}_{\Gamma.A,1}$ we have that

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \mathrm{N}_{1,\Gamma}\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$$

is inhabited as desired. □.

A CwF *supports Σ-types* if for $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.A)$ there is a type $\Sigma(A, B) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, and for $M \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$ and $N \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A\})$ there is an element $\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M, N) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Sigma(A, B))$. These constructions should satisfy for any $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$

(Σ-subst) $\Sigma(A, B)\{f\} = \Sigma(A\{f\}, B\{f.A\})$,

(Pair-subst) $\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M, N)\{f\} = \mathrm{Pair}_{A\{f\},B\{f.A\}}(M\{f\}, N\{f\})$

Next we need to specify the elimination operation E. First we construct a substitution

$$\mathrm{pair}_{A,B} : \Gamma.A.B \to \Gamma.\Sigma(A, B)$$

by

$$\mathrm{pair}_{A,B} =_{\mathrm{def}} \langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}_{A\{\mathrm{p}(A.B)\},B\{\mathrm{p}(A.B).A\}}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle.$$

For any $C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A, B))$, for any $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Sigma(A, B))$ and for any $K \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, C\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B}\})$ there is an element

$$\mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(P, K) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\})$$

such that

(Σ-conv) $\mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N),K) = K\{\langle\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A, N\rangle_B\}$.

Moreover for any $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, we require

(E-subst) $\mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(P,K)\{f\} = \mathrm{E}_{A\{f\},B\{f.A\},C\{f.\Sigma(A,B)\}}(P\{f\}, K\{f.A.B\})$.

For $A, B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ we introduce the notation

$$(A \times B) =_{\mathrm{def}} \Sigma(A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$$

Example B.2 First projection. Let $C = A\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B))\}$ in the above. Then for $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Sigma(A,B))$, we have

$$\mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(P,K) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A),$$

where

$$K \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, C\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B}\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, A\{\mathrm{p}(A.B)\}).$$

Thus we may let $K = \mathsf{v}_{A.B}$. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N), \mathsf{v}_{A.B}) & = & \mathsf{v}_{A.B}\{\langle\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A, N\rangle_B\} \\ & = & \mathsf{v}_A\{\mathrm{p}(B)\}\{\langle\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A, N\rangle_B\} \\ & = & \mathsf{v}_A\{\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A\} = M, \end{array}$$

as required. Let

$$\pi_{1,A,B}(P) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{E}_{A,B,A\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B))\}}(P, \mathsf{v}_{A.B}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A).$$

We have

$$\pi_{1,A,B}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N)) = M.$$

Example B.3 Second projection. Suppose $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.A)$. Using the first projection we construct

$$\langle \mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B)), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle : \Gamma.\Sigma(A,B) \longrightarrow \Gamma.A$$

Let

$$C = B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B)), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\} \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B)).$$

Now for $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Sigma(A,B))$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(P,K) & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B)), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\}\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}, \mathsf{v}_{A.B})\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}, \mathsf{v}_{(A.B)\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{E}(P, \mathsf{v}_{(A.B)\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \pi_{1,A,B}(P)\rangle\}) \end{array}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
K & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B)), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\}\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B}\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(\Sigma(A,B)), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}, \mathsf{v}_{A.B})\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}\rangle\}, \\
& & \quad \mathrm{v}_{A.B}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}\rangle.A.B\})) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B), \mathrm{v}_{(A.B)\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.B}, \mathrm{v}_B)\rangle\}})\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A.B), \mathrm{v}_{A.B}\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B, B\{\mathrm{p}(B)\})
\end{array}$$

We may let $K = \mathrm{v}_B$. Define $\pi_{2,A,B}(P) =_{\mathrm{def}} \mathrm{E}(P, \mathrm{v}_B) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \pi_{1,A,B}(P)\rangle\})$. Then

$$\pi_{2,A,B}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N)) = \mathrm{E}_{A,B,C}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N), \mathsf{v}_B) = \mathsf{v}_B\{\langle\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A, N\rangle_B\} = N,$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\pi_{2,A,B}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N)) & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{Pair}_{A,B}(M,N), \mathsf{v}_{(A.B)\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{Pair}(M,N)\rangle_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}})\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle\})
\end{array}$$

as required.

Example B.4 For $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, $B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.A)$, we define a mapping

$$\mathrm{unpair}_{A,B} : \Gamma.\Sigma(A,B) \longrightarrow \Gamma.A.B$$

First note that $\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)} : \Gamma.\Sigma(A,B) \longrightarrow \Gamma$, and

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B), \Sigma(A,B)\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B), \Sigma(A\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}\}, B\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}.A\})).
\end{array}$$

Thus

$$\pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B), A\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}\})$$

and hence

$$\langle \mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}, \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle : \Gamma.\Sigma(A,B) \longrightarrow \Gamma.A.$$

Further

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)}) & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B), B\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}.A\}\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\}) \\
& = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(A,B), B\{\langle \mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}, \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle\})
\end{array}$$

so we define

$$\mathrm{unpair}_{A,B} =_{\mathrm{def}} \langle\langle \mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(A,B)}, \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle, \pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(A,B)})\rangle : \Gamma.\Sigma(A,B) \longrightarrow \Gamma.A.B$$

A CwF *supports $+$-types* if for $A, B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ there is a type $A + B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, and for each $M \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$ there is $\mathrm{inl}_{A,B}(M) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A + B)$, and for each $N \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B)$ there is $\mathrm{inr}_{A,B}(N) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A + B)$. For all $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, these construction should satisfy

($+$-subst) $(A + B)\{f\} = A\{f\} + B\{f\}$

(inl-subst) $\mathrm{inl}_{A,B}(M)\{f\} = \mathrm{inl}_{A\{f\},B\{f\}}(M\{f\})$

(inr-subst) $\mathrm{inr}_{A,B}(N)\{f\} = \mathrm{inr}_{A\{f\},B\{f\}}(N\{f\})$

Furthermore for each $C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.A + B)$, each $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A + B)$ and each pair

$$K_1 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\langle \mathrm{p}A, \mathrm{inl}_{A\{\mathrm{p}A\},B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}(\mathrm{v}_A)\rangle_{A+B}\})$$

and

$$K_2 \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, C\{\langle \mathrm{p}B, \mathrm{inr}_{A\{\mathrm{p}B\},B\{\mathrm{p}B\}}(\mathrm{v}_B)\rangle_{A+B}\})$$

there is

$$\mathrm{D}_{A,B,C}(P, K_1, K_2) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, C\{\langle 1_\Gamma, P\rangle\})$$

such that

($+$-conv1) $\mathrm{D}_{A,B,C}(\mathrm{inl}_{A,B}(M), K_1, K_2) = K_1\{\langle 1_\Gamma, M\rangle_A\}$

($+$-conv2) $\mathrm{D}_{A,B,C}(\mathrm{inr}_{A,B}(N), K_1, K_2) = K_2\{\langle 1_\Gamma, N\rangle_B\}$.

Moreover for any $f : \Delta \to \Gamma$, the construction D should satisfy

(D-subst) $\mathrm{D}_{A,B,C}(P, K_1, K_2)\{f\} = \mathrm{D}_{A\{f\},B\{f\},C\{f.(A+B)\}}(P\{f\}, K_1\{f.A\}, K_2\{f.B\})$

Lemma B.5 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf that supports Σ. Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A, B, C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$.*

(a) If $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}\})$ and $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}\})$ are inhabited, then so is $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \times C)\{\mathrm{p}\})$

(b) $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, B\{\mathrm{p}\})$ and $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, C\{\mathrm{p}\})$ are inhabited.

(c) For any $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$,

$$(B \times C)\{f\} = (B\{f\} \times C\{f\}).$$

Proof. As for (a): suppose that $b \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$ and $c \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}(A)\})$. Find an element in

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \times C)\{\mathrm{p}A\}) &= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \Sigma(B, C\{\mathrm{p}B\})\{\mathrm{p}A\}) \\ &= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \Sigma(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\mathrm{p}(A).B\})). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\mathrm{p}(A).B\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.A}, b\rangle_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A)\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}), \mathsf{v}_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\rangle\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.A}, b\rangle_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}(B)\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(A)\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\langle 1_{\Gamma.A}, b\rangle, \mathsf{v}_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.A}, b\rangle\}\rangle\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}A, b\rangle\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$c \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\mathrm{p}(A).B\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.A}, b\rangle_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\}),$$

so

$$\mathrm{Pair}(b, c) \in \Sigma(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{\mathrm{p}(A).B\})$$

as required.

We prove (c) before (b): For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(B \times C)\{f\} &= \Sigma(B, C\{\mathrm{p}B\})\{f\}\\
&= \Sigma(B\{f\}, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{f.B\})\\
&= \Sigma(B\{f\}, C\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{f\})\})\\
&= B\{f\} \times C\{f\}
\end{aligned}$$

As for (b): We have using (c):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{v}_{B\times C} &\in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, (B \times C)\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\} \times C\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, \Sigma(B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}, C\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}\{\mathrm{p}\{B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}\}\}))
\end{aligned}$$

By (B.2),

$$\pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{B\times C}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}).$$

Thus $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\})$ is inhabited as required. By (B.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{B\times C}) &\in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, C\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}\{\mathrm{p}\{B\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}\}\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.B\times C}, \mathrm{E}(\mathrm{v}_{B\times C}, \mathrm{v})\rangle\})\\
&= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, C\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus also $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B \times C, C\{\mathrm{p}(B \times C)\})$ is inhabited as was to be shown. □.

Lemma B.6 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf that supports $+$. Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A, B, C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$.*

(a) If $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, A\{\mathrm{p}\})$ and $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, A\{\mathrm{p}\})$ are inhabited, then so is $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B + C), A\{\mathrm{p}\})$.

(b) $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, (B + C)\{\mathrm{p}\})$ and $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, (B + C)\{\mathrm{p}\})$ are inhabited.

Proof. As for (a): Suppose $b \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, A\{\mathrm{p}B\})$ and $c \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, A\{\mathrm{p}C\})$. We have $\mathrm{p}(B+C) : \Gamma.(B+C) \longrightarrow \Gamma$, so

$$\mathrm{p}(B+C).B : \Gamma.(B+C).B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.B$$

and

$$\mathrm{p}(B+C).C : \Gamma.(B+C).C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.C$$

and by substitution

$$b\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).B\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(B)(\mathrm{p}(B+C).B)\})$$

and

$$c\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).C\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(C)(\mathrm{p}(B+C).C)\})$$

Let

$$U = A\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}\{\mathrm{p}((B+C)\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\})\} \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.(B+C).(B+C)\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}).$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{v}_{(B+C)} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C), (B+C)\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C), B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}+C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\})$$

For

$$\begin{array}{rcl} K_1 & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, U\{\langle \mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}), \mathrm{inl}(\mathrm{v}_{B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\})\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).B\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(B)(\mathrm{p}(B+C).B)\}) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} K_2 & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, U\{\langle \mathrm{p}(C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}), \mathrm{inl}(\mathrm{v}_{C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}\{\mathrm{p}(C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\})\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C).C\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}, A\{\mathrm{p}(C)(\mathrm{p}(B+C).C)\}) \end{array}$$

there is

$$\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{v}_{(B+C)}, K_1, K_2) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C), U\{\langle 1_\Gamma, \mathrm{v}_{(B+C)}\rangle\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.(B+C), A\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\}).$$

Hence letting $K_1 = b\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).B\}$ and $K_2 = c\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).C\}$, we have

$$\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{v}_{(B+C)}, b\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).B\}, c\{\mathrm{p}(B+C).C\}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, (B+C), A\{\mathrm{p}(B+C)\})$$

as required.

As for (b): We have $\mathrm{v}_B \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, B\{\mathrm{p}B\})$ and $\mathrm{v}_C \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, C\{\mathrm{p}C\})$. Thus

$$\mathrm{inl}_{B\{\mathrm{p}B\}, C\{\mathrm{p}C\}}(\mathrm{v}_B) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, B\{\mathrm{p}B\}) + C\{\mathrm{p}B\})$$

and

$$\mathrm{inr}_{B\{\mathrm{p}C\},C\{\mathrm{p}C\}}(\mathrm{v}_C) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, B\{\mathrm{p}B\}) + C\{\mathrm{p}C\}).$$

Now $B\{\mathrm{p}B\}) + C\{\mathrm{p}B\} = (B+C)\{\mathrm{p}B\}$ and $B\{\mathrm{p}C\}) + C\{\mathrm{p}C\} = (B+C)\{\mathrm{p}C\}$, so $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.B, (B+C)\{\mathrm{p}B\})$ and $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.C, (B+C)\{\mathrm{p}C\})$ are inhabited as required.

□

A CwF *supports* Π*-types* if for $A \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.A)$ there is a type $\Pi(A,B) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$, and moreover for every $P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B)$ there is an element $\lambda_{A,B}(P) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Pi(A,B))$, and furthermore for any $M \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, \Pi(A,B))$ and any $N \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, A)$ this is an element $\mathrm{App}_{A,B}(M,N) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma, B\{\langle 1_\Gamma, N\rangle_A\})$, such that the following equations hold for any $f : \Theta \longrightarrow \Gamma$:

(β-conv) $\mathrm{App}_{A,B}(\lambda_{A,\tau}(P), N) = P\{\langle 1_\Gamma, N\rangle_A\}$,

(Π-subst) $\Pi(A,B)\{f\} = \Pi(A\{f\}, B\{f.A\})$,

(λ-subst) $\lambda_{A,B}(P)\{f\} = \lambda_{A\{f\},B\{f.A\}}(P\{f.A\})$,

(App-subst) $\mathrm{App}_{A,B}(M,N)\{f\} = \mathrm{App}_{A\{f\},B\{f.A\}}(M\{f\}, N\{f\})$.

For $A, B \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ we introduce the notation

$$(A \to B) =_{\mathrm{def}} \Pi(A, B\{\mathrm{p}(A)\}) \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$$

Lemma B.7 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cwf that supports Σ and Π. Suppose that $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A, B, C \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$.*

(a) $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}\})$ *is inhabited, if, and only if,* $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \to C)\{\mathrm{p}\})$ *is inhabited.*

(b) For any $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$,

$$(B \to C)\{f\} = (B\{f\} \to C\{f\}).$$

Proof. First we prove (b): For $f : \Delta \longrightarrow \Gamma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(B \to C)\{f\} &= \Pi(B, C\{\mathrm{p}B\})\{f\} \\ &= \Pi(B\{f\}, C\{\mathrm{p}B\}\{f.B\}) \\ &= \Pi(B\{f\}, C\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{f\})\}) \\ &= B\{f\} \to C\{f\}\end{aligned}$$

As for (a): Suppose first that $h \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\})$. To find an element $\lambda(P)$ of

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \to C)\{\mathrm{p}A\}) &= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, B\{\mathrm{p}A\} \to C\{\mathrm{p}A\}) \\ &= \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\}))\end{aligned}$$

it is sufficient to find

$$P \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\}).$$

We have

$$\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}} : \Gamma.A.B\{\mathrm{p}A\} \to \Gamma.\Sigma(A, B\{\mathrm{p}A\}) = \Gamma.A \times B,$$

so

$$h\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A.B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\}).$$

Now

$$\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}} =_{\mathrm{def}} \langle \mathrm{p}(A.(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})), \mathrm{Pair}(\mathrm{v}_{A.(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})}, \mathrm{v}_{B\{\mathrm{p}A\}})\rangle,$$

which entails that

$$C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\} = C\{\mathrm{p}(A.(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}))\} = C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\}).$$

Thus we can take $P = h\{\mathrm{pair}_{A,B\{\mathrm{p}A\}}\}$ to prove that $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \to C)\{\mathrm{p}A\})$ is inhabited.

Conversely, suppose that

$$k \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, (B \to C)\{\mathrm{p}A\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\})).$$

Need to find an element in

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}).$$

As above we have

$$\pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{A\times B}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, A\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}).$$

Hence

$$\langle \mathrm{p}(A \times B), \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{A\times B})\rangle : \Gamma.A \times B \longrightarrow \Gamma.A$$

Writing f for this map, we have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} k\{f\} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\})\{f\})) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{f\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{\mathrm{p}(B\{\mathrm{p}A\})\}\{f.B\{\mathrm{p}A\}\})) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}, C\{\mathrm{p}A\}\{f\}\{\mathrm{p}\{B\{\mathrm{p}(A)f\}\}\})) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, \Pi(B\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\{\mathrm{p}\{B\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\}\})) \end{array}$$

Furthermore as above we have

$$\pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{A\times B}) \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, B\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{App}(k\{f\}, \pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{A\times B})) & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\{\mathrm{p}\{B\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}\}\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.A\times B}, \pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{A\times B})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\}). \end{array}$$

This proves that $\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.A \times B, C\{\mathrm{p}(A \times B)\})$ is inhabited as required. □

Lemma B.8 *Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is a cwf that supports Π. Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$, $S, Q \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $R \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.S)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q, \Pi(S,R)\{\mathrm{p}Q\})$$

is inhabited, if and only if,

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\})$$

inhabited.

Proof. Assume that

$$f \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q, \Pi(S,R)\{\mathrm{p}Q\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q, \Pi(S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\})).$$

We have the map $\mathrm{p}(S).Q : \Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.Q$ and substituting this into f yields

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q\} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, \Pi(S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\})\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, \Pi(S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\}\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}\})) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, \Pi(S\{\mathrm{p}S\}\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\}\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}\})) \end{array}$$

We have

$$\mathrm{v}_{S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, S\{\mathrm{p}(S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\}) = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, S\{\mathrm{p}S\}\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & & \mathrm{App}(f\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q\}, \mathrm{v}_{S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}}) \in \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\}\{\mathrm{p}(S).Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}\}\{\langle 1_{\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}}, \mathrm{v}_{S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}}\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\langle \mathrm{p}(Q) \circ \mathrm{p}(S).Q, \mathrm{v}_{S.Q\{\mathrm{p}(S)\}}\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\langle \mathrm{p}(S) \circ \mathrm{p}\{Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}\}, \mathrm{v}_S\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})) \end{array}$$

as required.

As for the converse, suppose $g \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S)\})$. Construct a map $\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}$ as follows. We have

$$\mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}) : \Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\} \longrightarrow \Gamma$$

and

$$\mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}} \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, S\{\mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\})\})$$

so

$$\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle : \Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.S.$$

Now

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{v}_{Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}\{\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, Q\{\mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\})\}). \end{array}$$

Hence

$$\langle\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle : \Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\} \longrightarrow \Gamma.S.Q\{\mathrm{p}S\}.$$

Substituting this in to g,

$$\begin{array}{l} g\{\langle\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle\} \\ \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q\{\mathrm{p}S\})\{\langle\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle\}) \\ = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle\}) \\ = \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\}) \end{array}$$

Thus by lambda abstraction

$$\begin{array}{rcl} g\{\langle\langle \mathrm{p}(Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}), \mathrm{v}_{S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle, \mathrm{v}_{Q.S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}}\rangle\} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q, \Pi(S\{\mathrm{p}Q\}, R\{\mathrm{p}(Q).S\})) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.Q, \Pi(S, R)\{\mathrm{p}Q\}) \end{array}$$

as required. □

Lemma B.9 *Suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is a cwf that supports Σ. Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{C}$, $S, Q \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma)$ and $R \in \mathrm{Ty}(\Gamma.S)$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(S, R), Q\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma(S, R))\})$$

is inhabited, if and only if,

$$\mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.R, Q\{\mathrm{p}(S.R)\})$$

inhabited.

Proof. Suppose $f \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(S, R), Q\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma(S, R))\})$. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f\{\mathrm{pair}_{S,R}\} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.R, Q\{\mathrm{p}(\Sigma(S, R))\}\{\mathrm{pair}_{S,R}\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.R, Q\{\mathrm{p}(S.R)\}) \end{array}$$

as required.

Conversely, suppose $g \in \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.S.R, Q\{\mathrm{p}(S.R)\})$. Then

$$\begin{array}{rcl} g\{\mathrm{unpair}_{S,R}\} & \in & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(S, R), Q\{\mathrm{p}(S.R)\}\{\mathrm{unpair}_{S,R}\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(S, R), Q\{\mathrm{p}(S.R)\}\{\langle\langle \mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(S,R)}, \pi_1(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(S,R)})\rangle, \pi_2(\mathrm{v}_{\Sigma(S,R)})\rangle\}) \\ & = & \mathrm{Tm}(\Gamma.\Sigma(S, R), Q\{\mathrm{p}_{\Sigma(S,R)}\}) \end{array}$$

as required. □

Theorem 7.2 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a cwf which admits the type constructions $\Sigma, \Pi, +, \mathrm{N}_0$ and N_1 then $(\mathcal{C}, \mathrm{Pr}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is a cwf with first-order doctrine.*

Proof. Let the logical operations be defined according to the propositions-as-types principle:

- $\top_\Gamma = \mathrm{N}_{1,\Gamma}$,
- $\bot_\Gamma = \mathrm{N}_{0,\Gamma}$,
- $P \wedge Q = P \times Q$,
- $P \vee Q = P + Q$,
- $P \to Q = P \to Q$,
- $\forall_S(R) = \Pi(S, R)$,
- $\exists_S(R) = \Sigma(S, R)$.

Now the properties of the first-order doctrine follows by Lemmas B.1, B.5, B.6, B.7, B.8, and B.9, and the substitution properties of the type constructions N_k, $+$, Π and Σ. $\square$